

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

TE TE Raj K. Patel

Plaintiff(s),

V.

THE UNITED STATES,

Defendant.

Case No. 22-1446 C

Judge

COMPLAINT

Your complaint must be clearly handwritten or typewritten, and you must sign and declare under penalty of perjury that the facts are correct. If you need additional space, you may use another blank page. A fillable pdf is available at <http://uscfc.uscourts.gov/filing-a-complaint>.

If you intend to proceed without the prepayment of filing fees (*in forma pauperis* (IFP)), pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, you must file along with your complaint an application to proceed IFP.

1. **JURISDICTION.** State the grounds for filing this case in the United States Court of Federal Claims. The United States Court of Federal Claims has limited jurisdiction (*see* e.g., 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491-1509).

Big Tucker Act, 1491(a) complementing contract-in-fact-at-hand

2. PARTIES

Plaintiff, Raj K. Patel, resides at 6850 East 21st Street
(Street Address)

Indianapolis, IN 46219, 317-450-6651
(City, State, ZIP Code) (Telephone Number)

If more than one plaintiff, provide the same information for each plaintiff below.

3. PREVIOUS LAWSUITS. Have you begun other lawsuits in the United States Court of Federal Claims? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please list cases: Patel v. United States, No. 1:22-cv-734 (C.F.C. Aug. 12, 2022)
Patel v. United States, No. 1:22-cv-02004-LAS (C.F.C. Nov. 5, 2021)

4. STATEMENT OF THE CLAIM. State as briefly as possible the facts of your case. Describe how the United States is involved. You must state exactly what the United States did, or failed to do, that has caused you to initiate this legal action. Be as specific as possible and use additional paper as necessary.


Breach of Contract causes harm and injury, plus other independent claims.

5. **RELIEF.** Briefly state exactly what you want the court to do for you.

\$4,544,000,000 +, plus constitutional re-distribution of power under the court's constitution

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Signed this 3rd day of October, 2022.
(day) (month) (year)



Signature of Plaintiff(s)

No. _____

In The

United States Court of Federal Claims

THE EXCELLENT THE EXCELLENT RAJ K. PATEL,
from all capacities,

Plaintiff

v.

UNITED STATES,

Defendant.

NEW CIVIL ACTION

PRO SE COMPLAINT

T.E., T.E. Raj K. Patel (*pro se*)
Indiana | Georgia | New Jersey
6850 East 21st Street
Indianapolis, IN 46219
Marion County
rajp2010@gmail.com
www.rajpatel.live
317-450-6651

October 3, 2022

CERTIFICATE OF INTEREST

I, THE EXCELLENT, THE EXCELLENT Raj K. Patel (pro se), am appearing without counsel, like I did in the courts below. Giving Full Faith to the United States Constitution, I use the Authority of my omnipresent Styles and Office in these proceedings into which I avail myself. U.S. const. art. IV, § 1 & amend. XIV, & art. VI, § 1 referring to the Treaty of Paris (1783) & Paris Peace Treaty – Cong. Proclamation of Jan. 14, 1784.

I have completed five (5) out of the six (6) semesters of my juris dr. candidacy at the U. of Notre Dame L. Sch. in South Bend, IN., where I was enrolled from August 2015 to November 2017, and I have completed sixty-eight (68) out of the ninety (90) credit hours for a juris dr. candidacy at the Notre Dame L. Sch.

Such, I have completed the minimum number of credit hours required by the accrediting Am. B. Ass’n (“A.B.A.”) to allow a law school to accredit me a juris dr. degree.

Amongst the grades in my juris dr. academic courses I received at the Notre Dame L. Sch., I received an A-/A in contracts law, an A-/A in civil procedure, and a B/A in constitutional law, while under Weapon S. In the summer of 2016, I worked as summer associate with the City of Atlanta Law Department in Atlanta, GA. In the summer of 2017, I worked as a summer associate at Barnes & Thornburg LLP in Indianapolis, IN.

And, I hold a Bachelor of Arts in Poli. Sci. and *cum laude* in Religion from Emory U., Inc. of Atlanta, Georgia, and I attended both Oxford College and Emory College, and graduated, in 2014, with a 3.718/4.0 grade point average with no pass/fail grades.

Emory U., Inc. is ranked as a top-20 or top-25 *U.S. News* Tier 1 best national university, and the Notre Dame L. Sch. is ranked as a *U.S. News* Top 25 best law school in the United States.

I was Student Body President of the Brownsburg Cmty. Sch. Corp. from 2009-2010 and Student Body President of Emory U., Inc. from 2013-2014. I was also the Notre Dame L. Sch. Student B. Ass’n Rep. to the Ind. State B. Ass’n from September 2017 to November 2017. All jurisdictions are “local” and with an “international” constituency.

Each time I was elected Student Body President, I attained thenceforth omnipresent Styles (“THE EXCELLENT” for each election) which are protected by both the Privileges & Immunities Clause and Privileges or Immunities Clause of the United States Constitution. U.S. const. art. IV, § 2, cl. 1 & amend. XIV, § 1, cl. 2. *See generally* Federalist 80 & *Printz v. United States*, 521 U.S. 898, 918 (1997) quoting *Principality of Monaco v. Mississippi*, 292 U.S. 313, 322 (1934).

I am well read in the material law. I have not received legal advice or counsel from anyone else for this case.

RCFC 40.2 NOTICE OF DIRECTLY RELATED CASE

T.E., T.E. Raj K. Patel v. United States, No. 1:21-cv-02004-LAS (Fed. Cl. Nov. 5, 2021), *aff'd in part & rev'd in part*, No. 2022-1131 (Fed. Cir. May 19/June 2, 2022), *cert. denied*, No. 22-5280 (U.S. Oct. 3, 2022).

T.E. T.E. Raj K. Patel v. United States, No. 1:22-cv-0734-LAS (C.F.C. Aug. 12, 2022).

The case is now with some more facts and more favorable case law, including for causation. The case has been re-evaluated brought under attention to the White House, as if the contract was formed under the Contract Dispute Act, with the Presidency as the agency rather than the White House. Associate General Counselor Marina M. Kozmycz, J.D., Marina.M.Kozmycz@oa.eop.gov, seems to be assigned to the case in the White House. *Vargas v. United States*, 114 Fed.Cl. 226, 236 (C.F.C. 2014) (“The government’s reliance on 28 U.S.C. § 516 is misplaced.”).

The cases are directly related because “(A) they involve the same parties and are based on the same or similar claims;” and “(B) they involve the same contract, property, or patent.” RCFC 40.2(a)(2)(A)-(B).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CERTIFICATE OF INTEREST	i
RCFC 40.2 NOTICE OF DIRECTLY RELATED CASE.....	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iii
RELATED CASES.....	iv
<i>PRO SE COMPLAINT</i>	1
SUBJECT-MATTER JURISDICTION.....	5
WELL-PLEADED COMPLAINT STANDARDS	7
PROCEDURAL HISTORY	13
STATEMENT OF FACTS	19
CLAIMS.....	49
DEMAND FOR RELIEF	74
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE.....	I

RELATED CASES

FEDERAL CASES

1. *Patel v. United States*, No. 2022-1131 (Fed. Cir. May 19/June 2, 2022), *cert. denied*, No. 22-5280 (U.S. 2022).
2. *T.E., T.E. Raj K. Patel v. United States*, No. 1:21-cv-02004-LAS (C.F.C. Nov. 5, 2021).
3. *Patel v. Biden et al.*, No. 2022-5057 (D.C. Cir. June 8, 2022).
4. *Patel v. Biden et al.*, No. 1:22-cv-00394-UNA (D.D.C. Mar. 9, 2022).
5. *Patel v. Chief of Staff, The Executive Offices of the President of the United States*, No. 2022-1962 (Fed. Cir. 2022) (mot. for stay) (filed June 29, 2022).
6. *Patel v. The Executive Offices of the President*, No. 7419 (CBCA June 24, 2022).
7. *Patel v. Biden et al.*, No. 1:22-cv-01658-DLF (D.D.C. June 29, 2022) (pet. for writ of mandamus § 1361).
8. *Patel v. Biden et al.*, No. 1:22-cv-2957-MLB (N.D. Ga. Oct. 3, 2022) (pet for. writ of mandamus § 1361).
9. *Patel v. United States*, No. 1:22-cv-00734-LAS (C.F.C. 2022) (pet. for writ of mandamus § 1651).
10. *Patel v. United States*, No. 2:22-cv-02624-WB (E.D. Pa. 2022) (pet. for writ of mandamus § 1361), *transferred*, No. 1:22-cv-01576-JPH-MG (S.D.I.N. 2022), *dismissed due to filing bar*.

Federal Courts Without Subject-Matter Jurisdiction for Big Tucker Act Claims

11. *Patel v. Trump Corp.*, No. 20-1513, 141 S. Ct. 2761 (June 14, 2021), *reh'r'g denied*, 141 S.Ct. 2887 (U.S. Aug. 2, 2021).
12. *Doe v. Trump Corp.*, No. 20-1706, 2020 WL 10054085 (2d Cir. Oct. 9, 2020).
13. *Doe et al. v. The Trump Corp. et al.*, No. 1:18-cv-9936-LGS (S.D.N.Y. May 26, 2020), Dkt. 272.
14. *Patel v. F.B.I. et al.*, No. 1:18-cv-3441-RLY-DML (S.D.I.N. Nov. 13, 2018).
15. *Patel v. F.B.I. et al.*, No. 1:18-cv-3442-WTL-DML (S.D.I.N. Nov. 13, 2018).
16. *Patel v. F.B.I. et al.*, No. 1:18-cv-3443-TWP-MJD (S.D.I.N. Nov. 13, 2018).
17. *Patel v. Trump et al.*, No. 1:20-cv-454-SEB-DML (S.D.I.N. Feb. 19, 2020).
18. *Patel v. Trump et al.*, No. 1:20-cv-758-RLY-MJD (S.D.I.N. Apr. 14, 2020).
19. *Trump v. Vance, Jr. et al.*, No. 1:19-cv-8694-VM (S.D.N.Y. July 9, 2020), Dkt. 45.
20. *Patel v. Patel et al.*, No. 20-2713 (7th Cir. Jan. 21, 2021).
21. *Patel v. Patel et al.*, No. 1:20-cv-1772-TWP-MPB (S.D.I.N. Sept. 1, 2020).
22. *Carroll v. Trump*, No. 1:20-cv-7311-LAK (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 28, 2020), Dkt. 36.

23. *Patel v. Martinez et al.*, No. 3:21-cv-241 RLM-JPK (N.D.I.N. Apr. 8, 2021).
24. *Patel v. The President of the United States Joe Biden et al.*, No. 2:21-cv-01345-APG-EJY (D. Nev. Aug. 9, 2021).
25. *Patel v. United States*, No. 1:21-cv-22729-BB (S.D. Fla. Aug. 12, 2021).
26. *Patel v. United States et al.*, No. 1:21-cv-2219-JMS-TAB (S.D.I.N. Aug. 20, 2021).
27. *Patel v. United States et al.*, No. 1:21-cv-2263-UNA (D.D.C. Sept. 8, 2021).
28. *Patel v. United States et al.*, No. 2:21-cv-4160-NKL (W.D. Mo. Sept. 13, 2021).
29. *Patel v. United States et al.*, No. 2:21-cv-16029-SDW-CLW (D.N.J. Sept. 20, 2021).
30. *Patel v. The United States et al.*, No. 1:21-cv-6553-LTS (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 20, 2021).
31. *Patel v. The United States et al.*, No. 1:21-cv-2250-RLY-MG (S.D.I.N. Sept. 21, 2021).
32. *Patel v. United States et al.*, No. 1:21-cv-11429-LTS (D. Mass. Sept. 24, 2021).
33. *Patel v. Biden et al.*, No. 21-5155 (D.C. Cir. Sept. 27, 2021).
34. *In Re Raj K. Patel*, No. 21-5153 (D.C. Cir. Aug. 6, 2021).
35. *Patel v. Biden et al.*, No. 1:21-cv-1076-TSC (D.D.C. July 2, 2021).
36. *The Excellent Raj Patel v. The United States et al.*, No. 1:21-cv-3335-MLB (N.D. Ga. Oct. 5, 2021).
37. *The Excellent Raj Patel v. The United States et al.*, No. 1:21-cv-3376-MLB (N.D. Ga. Oct. 5, 2021).
38. *Patel v. United States et al.*, No. 3:21-cv-628-RLM-APR (N.D.I.N. Oct. 7, 2021).
39. *Patel v. Biden et al.*, No. 22-cv-465-JMS-MG (S.D.I.N. Mar. 24, 2022).
40. *In Re Raj Patel*, No. 22-mc-00024-TWP (S.D.I.N. Mar. 28, 2022) (2 yr. prejudice from filing before the S.D.I.N.). *Contra*. ECF 31, *Patel v. United States*, No. 22-1131 (Fed. Cir. 2022).
41. **NOT RELATED:** *Patel v. The Univ. of Notre Dame du Lac*, No. 1:22-cv-01329-JPH-MG (S.D.I.N. July 8, 2022) (notice of removal) (dismissed), *pending appeal*, 22-2251 (7th Cir. 202_). (*see infra* #43).

STATE CASE

42. *Patel v. Patel*, No. 32D05-1808-PO-000372 (Ind. Super. Ct. Aug. 21, 2018).
43. **NOT RELATED:** *Patel v. The Univ. of Notre Dame du Lac*, No. 49D05-2206-CC-019517 (Ind. Super. Ct., Marion Cnty. 5 2022)

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT FOR FEDERAL CLAIMS

THE EXCELLENT THE EXCELLENT
RAJ K. PATEL, from all capacities,

Plaintiff

v.

THE UNITED STATES

Defendant

No. _____

Dated: October 3, 2022

PRO SE COMPLAINT

I, T.E., T.E Raj K. Patel (*pro se*), respectfully move this United States Court for Federal Claims to enforce a contract, for this battery/assault/torture/genocide/civil rights violation/conspiracy through a psycho-bio-tech stress weapon (body control too, as it made me drive a car) to end and to restore the privileges and/or immunities (privileges and/or immunities during and after office and for all acts before taking office, as privileges or immunities are “basic” protections, in other words for and against inherently violent things, such as for allowing use of force without statutory license and against a bio-tech stress-depression weapon) I hold under the United States Constitution, including while I was the Representative to the Indiana State Bar Association of the Great State of Indiana and which I carry as 2013-2014 Student Government Association President of Emory University, Inc. (corporate sovereign 2013-present) in Atlanta, Georgia and 2009-2010 Student Body President of the Brownsburg Community School Corporation (“B.C.S.C.”) (corporate sovereign 2009-present) in Brownsburg, Indiana. 18 U.S.C. §§ 241, 242, 245(b)(2)(A)-(B) & (F), *Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.*, 134 S. Ct. 2751, 2270 (U.S. 2014), 28 U.S.C. § 1491(a)(1)-(2), and 18 U.S.C. §§ 2340 *et seq.* U.S. const. art. IV,

§ 2¹ & amend. XIV, § 1²; U.S. const. art. VI, § 1 and Grievances 21 & 23, Decl. of Indep. (1776)³; U.S. const. art. IV, § 1; *United Bldg. & Constr. Trades Council v. Mayor & Council of Camden*, 465 U.S. 208 (1984); *see also* 18 U.S.C. § 2385 (“political subdivision”). *Compare United States v. Arthrex, Inc.*, No. 19-1434 at p. 23, 594 U.S. ____ (2021) (Roberts, C.J., The Constitutional hierarchy requires “the exercise of executive power [to remain] accountable to the people.”) (“executive power” includes power to communicate, recognize, correct, constrain, incapacitate, touch, assault, kill, defend, etc.) *with* “political power” (includes all of the executive Powers and the power to make laws and adjudge). Central to my complaint, in this case number, is the enforcement of a few contracts or a multi-part contract with the United States. In addition, I plead for the Taking of my intellectual property, my word patterns, through means and methods of advance weaponry (left ear, *infra*), which is in control of the United States, such as the F.B.I. and/or C.I.A and/or The Oval Office. *See generally* 18 U.S.C. § 175. In addition to the necessary trespass and auto-stalking and because of the number of encounters I have had with and am having with this stress weapon and the other parties involved, local, state, and federal support was important or the lack thereof. *See generally Asahi Metal Indus. Co. Ltd. v. Superior Court*, 480 U.S. 102 (1987) (stream of commerce; supply-chain theory) and 18 U.S.C. §§ 1951 & 1961. Counter-weapons also do not work, which are available through either over-the-counter or prescription, which would stop attack on the human evolution of my future direct descendants, as the weapon is closely connected with the brain or cerebellum. U.S. const. amend. II. Beyond these aforementioned statutory and

-
1. “The citizens of each state shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several states.”
 2. “No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States...” (includes state- and federal- created corporations, *see* Grievance 21, Decl. of Independence (1776) and U.S. const. art. VI, § 1).
 3. Disengaging the bio-tech weapon is therefore a priority for T.H. (T.E.) President of the United States.

constitutional matters, my First Amendment right to Free Exercise of Religion (i.e. gains for forward human evolution, including physical exercising; my religion tells me to workout; brain's religious-side was prevented from being used, *see* 18 U.S.C. § 247(a)(2) and *infra* (Framer's comment on the mind))⁴, Freedom of Expression, Academic Freedom, prohibition of Establishment of Religion (Plaintiff, who is Constitutionally styled "The Excellent" in the United States for his political executive offices, including from Emory University (school of one of President Obama's half-brothers, Mark Obama))⁵, White, Indian, etc. terrorists, Fourth Amendment unlawful search and seizure, 13th Amendment, 5th and/or 14th Amendment Due Process, the Guarantee Clause, federally-prohibited "pains" were violated, breach of contract, defamation, theft of intellectual property (my verbatim word patterns), and civil-Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations ("R.I.C.O.") Act (with possible multiple predicate crimes) violations, tortious interference in a business transaction, honest services duties, and functional removal the constitutional office of a candidate for the United States Presidency. 18 U.S.C. §§ 1931-34, 1951, & 1961 *et seq.* (minimum two predicate acts include extortion of intellectual property, which is also Taking, interference of law school applications, interference with college applications, interference in academic coursework in middle school, high school, Emory University, and Notre Dame Law School, making me obese ("serious bodily injury"), interfering with my political subdivision incumbencies from 2009-2010, 2013-2014, and 2017, use of biological weapon, and use of neuro-chemical weapon) and 42

4. "The 'exercise of religion' involves 'not only belief and profession but the performance of (or abstention from) physical acts' that are 'engaged in for religious reasons.'" *Hobby Lobby*, 134 S. Ct. at 2270 quoting *Employment Div. v. Smith*, 494 U.S. 872, 877 (1990). "It means, too, the right to express those beliefs and to establish one's religious (or nonreligious) self-definition in the political, civic, and economic life of our larger community." *Hobby Lobby*, 134 S. Ct. at 2285 (Kennedy, J., concurring).

5. *Students for Fair Admissions, Inc. v. President & Fellows of Harvard Coll.*, No. 20-1199 (U.S. 202_) (especially applicable to the 2009-2010 and 2014-2015 and other admissions cohorts) (describing terroristic efforts to re-categorize Asian-Americans, East-, South- and Central-, into "all Asians are smart" or "all Asians are not smart" based on its admissions application "likeability" factor).

U.S.C. § 1983. 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961–1968 & 1343–1346; *United States v. Nixon*, 418 U.S. 683 (1974); and *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971). Relief is proper under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2) and the respective civil relief statutes for R.I.C.O., 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961 *et seq.*, honest services fraud, 18 U.S.C. §§ 1931-34, prohibition on intimidating in commerce, 18 U.S.C. § 1951, interstate and foreign racketeering, 18 U.S.C. § 1952, civil rights, 42 U.S.C. §§ 1981-1985 and 18 U.S.C. §§ 241 *et seq.*, and genocide, 18 U.S.C. §§ 1091(b)-(c). 28 U.S.C. § 1652. Nonetheless, the University of Notre Dame du Lac, in South Bend, Indiana, denied me my re-admissions permanently as of July-August 2021, even though medical professionals approved me for re-admissions since January 2018, and its acts violate the privileges of being a student who seeking a juris doctor degree. *See e.g.*, 18 U.S.C. §§ 241 *et seq.* (privilege of being a student; incumbency of being Representative from the Notre Dame Law School Student Bar Association to the Indiana State Bar Association) (all university admissions is regulated by the United States Department of Defense, as I know through partisan information) (local police is regulated by the United States Department of Homeland Security) (lawyers are very likely to continue politics and are essential in cultivating government policy). *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

Based on the interpretation of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, at least the contract claims should stick because the Court of Federal Claims “correctly concluded,” but did not reason correctly. *TE TE Patel v. United States*, No. 1:21-cv-02004-LAS (C.F.C. Nov. 5, 2021), Dkt. 10, *modified by aff’g in part & rev’g in part*, No. 22-1131 (Fed. Cir. 2022), ECF 31 [*see* Ex. F], *aff’d* ECF 44. *United States v. Navajo Nation*, 556 U.S. 287, 290 (2009) (“*Navajo Nation II*”) (citation and internal quotation marks omitted) cited in Op. & Order, *Patel v. United States*, No. 22-1131 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 11, 2022), ECF 31, *aff’d*, ECF 44.

In the alternative, this court should construe this complaint as a motion for judicial review and issue the appropriate relief.

Regardless, the monetary sum should be **approximately \$4,544,703,655.35 after taxes**, plus other non-money compensation and relief.

SUBJECT-MATTER JURISDICTION

[1] The United States, Sovereign, hegemon, protector, and keeper of our Excellencies' weaponries and other shared technologies, through Its Government, is the Defendant. *See* U.S. const. art. VI, § 1. *Cf.* U.S. const. amends. IX (with basic and basis protections, per art. IV, § 1 and amend. XIV, § 1) & XI. *United States v. Testan*, 424 U.S. 392, 398 (1976) (The Tucker Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1491, "waives" the United States "sovereign immunity.") and *Fisher v. United States*, 402 F.3d 1167, 1172 (Fed. Cir. 2005).

[2] *Nat'l Bank v. Republic of China*, 348 U.S. 356, 362 (1955) (the covenant of good faith and fair dealing prohibits the claiming of immunity, including those legally and statutory provided).

[3] Jurisdiction for the Court of Federal Claims is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1491(a)(1). Contract Cl., U.S. const. art. I, § 10, cl. 1.5. *See also* 28 U.S.C. § 2501, paras. 1 & 3 ("disability" applied to repressing going to court and overall stress, *see generally infra*). "47. Court of Federal Claims Litigation," *Justice Manual*, Civil Resource Manual, The United States Department of Justice (2018), <https://www.justice.gov/jm/civil-resource-manual-47-court-federal-claims-litigation> (last visited Aug. 16, 2021). For purposes of applying the statute of limitations in 28 U.S.C. § 2501, para. 1, a claim against the United States first accrues on the date when "all events have occurred that are necessary to enable the plaintiff to bring suit." *Martinez v. United States*, 333 F.3d 1295, 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (*en banc*).

The Constitution is violated, especially the 5th Amendment Due Process (with Lenity), the 14th Amendment Due Process (with Lenity), the Privileges and Immunities Clause (*In re Quarles and Butler*, 158 U.S. 532 (1895)) (including but not limited to “the right to inform the United States authorities of violation of its laws”), and the Privileges or Immunities Clause. *See e.g., United Bldg.*, 465 U.S. at 208 and *Bivens*, 403 U.S. at 388.

Acts of Congress material to the case include, but are not limited to, 18 U.S.C. §§ 241 *et seq.* (deprivation of privileges and/or immunities), 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961-1968 (R.I.C.O.), 42 U.S.C. §§ 1981-1983 (deprivation of civil rights, 5th Amendment; theft of intellectual property), and 18 U.S.C. §§ 1931-1934 (honest services) (theft of intellectual property; protection).

A Founding Document, the Declaration of Independence (1776) (“certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness”), are also material, as it protects intellectual property. U.S. const. art. VI, §§ 1-2 (“Preceding Clause”, prior treaty engagement; Supremacy Clause) (Paris Peace Engagement – Congressional Proclamation of Jan. 14, 1784 (*See* Yale L. Sch.’s Avalon Project, [https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th century/parispr2.asp](https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/parispr2.asp)) (every citizen is required to uphold the Treaty of Paris “sincerely, strictly, and completely,” as it conditionally transferred sovereignty to the United States and Sister States while keeping King George III and his lawful successors as The Absolute)⁶. *Contra.* 28 U.S.C. § 1502 (limits of this

6. “Magistracy” includes student government presidents’ jurisdictions and has vestiges of political Power, i.e. analogous to the powers of an absolute monarch, some of which are also vested in the Commander-in-Chief of the United States Military, Armed Forces, and Space Force; “executive Power” vested in the President and “judicial Power” vested in the Supreme Court and lower tribunals, including but not limited to from the Roman Kingdom/Empire/Republic and the *shah*’s and *raja*’s of India, including of the Boston Tea Party. *See* Grievance 20, Decl. of Indep. (1776) (System of English Laws includes the vestiges of the politics Great Britain replaced), Treaty of Paris (1783) and U.S. const. art. VI, § 1, art. II, § 1, cl. 1, & art. III, § 1, cl. 1. *See also* President John Adams, “Death of George Washington,” December 19, 1799, <https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches/december-19-1799-death-george-washington> (Accessed Aug. 19, 2021) (His example is now complete, and it will teach wisdom and virtue to magistrates, citizens, and men, not only in the present age, but in future generations as

statute as applied to “prior engagements,” Article VI, Section 1 of the United States Constitution (1789), is unconstitutional) (Congress must allow all lower tribunals to interpret prior engagements, including Treaties by the United States in Congress and the Articles of Confederation, and/or Congress must allow all lower tribunals to interpret Treaty of Paris (1783) because the Treaty or the Treaty’s Congressional ratification (Jan. 14, 1784) creates the United States as a new nation). U.S. const. art. VI, § 1 & art. III, § 1. *See also infra*, note 12. *Contra*. Treaties approved after the Ratification of the United States Constitution (1789).

[4] Damages owed to Plaintiff by Defendant-United States exceeds \$10,000. *Simanonok v. Simanonok*, 918 F.2d 947, 950-51 (Fed. Cir. 1990). 28 U.S.C. § 1491(a)(1). “47. Court of Federal Claims Litigation,” *Justice Manual*, Civil Resource Manual, The United States Department of Justice (2018), <https://www.justice.gov/jm/civil-resource-manual-47-court-federal-claims-litigation> (last visited Aug. 16, 2021).

WELL-PLEADED COMPLAINT STANDARDS

“[A] *pro se* complaint, however inartfully pleaded, must be held to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers.” *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007). *Pro se* plaintiffs are “not expected to frame issues with the precision of a common law pleading.” *Roche v. U.S. Postal Serv.*, 828 F.2d 1555, 1558 (Fed. Cir. 1987). *Pro se*

long as our history shall be read.). Cf. Magistracy of contemporary “magistrate judge.” *See also* President James Monroe, “Seventh Annual Message (Monroe Doctrine),” December 2, 1823, <https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches/december-2-1823-seventh-annual-message-monroe-doctrine> (Accessed Aug. 19, 2021):

The Military Academy has attained a degree of perfection in its discipline and instruction equal, as is believed, to any institution of its kind in any country...It is unnecessary to treat here of the vast improvement made in the system itself by the adoption of this Constitution and of its happy effect in elevating the character and in protecting the rights of the nation as well as individuals. To what, then, do we owe these blessings? It is known to all that we derive them from the excellence of our institutions. Ought we not, then, to adopt every measure which may be necessary to perpetuate them?”

plaintiffs must establish this Court's jurisdiction over their claims by a preponderance of the evidence. *See Alston-Bullock v. United States*, 122 Fed. Cl. 38, 40 (2015); *see also Spengler v. United States*, 688 F. App'x 917, 920 (Fed. Cir. 2017). "The fact that [the plaintiff] acted *pro se* in the drafting of his complaint may explain its ambiguities." *Minehan v. United States*, 75 Fed. Cl. 249, 253 (2007); *accord Henke v. United States*, 60 F.3d 795, 799 (Fed. Cir. 1995). *Nat'l Bank v. Republic of China*, 348 U.S. 356, 362 (1955) (the covenant of good faith and fair dealing prohibits the claiming of immunity, including those legally and statutory provided).

Under the RCFC 8(a)(2), a pleading must contain a "short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." As the Court held in *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544 (2007), the pleading standard Rule 8 announces does not require "detailed factual allegations," but it...must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, "enough to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face." *Id.*, at 570. A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged. *Id.*, at 556. The plausibility standard is not akin to a "probability requirement," but it asks for more than a sheer possibility that a defendant has acted unlawfully. *Id.* and *see also Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 662. In other words, the court must assess whether "a claim has been stated adequately" and whether "it may be supported by [a] showing [of] any sets of facts consistent with the allegations in the complaint." *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 563. The plaintiff's factual allegations "must be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level." *Id.* at 555. In reviewing plaintiff's allegations in support of jurisdiction, Federal Claims Court must presume all undisputed facts are true and construe all reasonable inferences in plaintiff's favor. *Scheuer v. Rhodes*, 416 U.S. 232, 236 (1974), *abrogated on other grounds by Harlow v. Fitzgerald*, 457 U.S. 800, 814-15 (1982); *Reynolds v.*

Army & Air Force Exch. Serv., 846 F.2d 746, 747 (Fed. Cir. 1988) (citations omitted). “[Complaints] must be construed so as to do justice.” RCFC 7(b) & 8(e).

For the parts in a complaint related to R.I.C.O, *H.J. Inc. v. NW Bell Tel. Co.*, 492 U.S. 229, 248-250 (1989) states, as precedent to *Twombly* (2007) and *Iqbal* (2009), that “the facts alleged in the complaint [by a petitioner or prosecutor, must be read] in the light most favorable to petitioners...[and courts may only dismiss] the complaint if “it is clear that no relief could be granted under any set of facts that could be proved consistent with the allegations.” *H.J. Inc.*, 492 U.S. at 248-250 citing *Hishon v. King & Spalding*, 467 U.S. 69, 73 (1984). “Congress drafted RICO broadly enough to encompass a wide range of criminal activity, taking many different forms and likely to attract a broad array of perpetrators operating in many different ways.” *H.J. Inc.*, 492 U.S. at 248. Moreover,

As [Supreme] Court stressed in *Sedima*, in rejecting a pinched construction of RICO's provision for a private civil action, adopted by a lower court because it perceived that RICO's use against non-organized-crime defendants was an “abuse” of the Act, “Congress wanted to reach both *legitimate*’ and *illegitimate*’ enterprises.” 473 U.S. at 499. *Legitimate businesses “enjoy neither an inherent incapacity for criminal activity nor immunity from its consequences”*; and, as a result, § 1964(c)’s use “against respected businesses allegedly engaged in a pattern of specifically identified criminal conduct is hardly a sufficient reason for assuming that the provision is being misconstrued.”

Sedima, S.P.R.L. v. Imrex Co., Inc., 473 U.S. 479 (1985). In the concurrence of *H.J. Inc.*, 492 U.S. at 256, Justice Scalia wrote:

However unhelpful its guidance may be, however, I think the Court is correct in saying that nothing in the statute supports the proposition that predicate acts constituting part of a single scheme (or single episode) can never support a cause of action under RICO. Since the Court of Appeals here rested its decision on the contrary proposition, I concur in the judgment of the Court reversing the decision below.

See generally Dred Scott v. Sandford, 60 U.S. (19 How.) 393 (1856), *United States v. Nixon*, 418 U.S. 683 (1974) (no person or no project/experiment is above the law, the Federalist Project/Experiment), *Clinton v. Jones*, 520 U.S. 681 (1997) (individual’s acts

before becoming president are not subject to Presidential immunity), and *Nixon v. Fitzgerald*, 457 U.S. 731 (1982) (immunity limited to official acts). *See also* RCFC 21. Cf. parties to a case. “No man is above the law and no man is below it: nor do we ask any man’s permission when we ask him to obey it,” said United States President Theodore Roosevelt. *See also* Paris Peace Treaty – Cong. Proclamation of Jan. 14, 1784 (every citizen should uphold the Treaty of Paris “sincerely, strictly, and completely”). *See also* U.S. const. amend. XI (states not immune). *See also* *Downs v. Bidwell*, 182 U.S. 244, 382 (1901) (“No higher duty rests upon this Court than to exert its full authority to prevent all violation of the principles of the Constitution.”). *U.S. v. Lee*, 106 U.S. 196, 220 (1882) (Miller, J.):

No man in this country is so high that he is above the law. No officer of the law may set that law at defiance with impunity. All the officers of the government, from the highest to the lowest, are creatures of the law and are bound to obey it. It is the only supreme power in our system of government, and every man who by accepting office participates in its functions is only the more strongly bound to submit to that supremacy and to observe the limitations which it imposes upon the exercise of the authority which it gives...

Courts of justice are established not only to decide upon the controverted rights of the citizens as against each other, but also upon rights in controversy between them and the government...[the] Secretary of War...[and] officer had no more authority to make than the humblest private citizen.

Substantive Due Process and the Privileges and Immunities Clause both require my complaint and statements and evidence to be weighed in my favor. *Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health Organization*, No. 19-1392 * 14-15 (U.S. Jun. 24, 2022) (as applied to the Fifth Amendment’s Due Process Clause, the original Privileges and Immunities Clause, and “Liberty” referred in U.S. const. art. VI, § 1 (Decl. of Indep. (1776)))⁷. *Dobbs*, No. 19-

7. *Dobbs*, No. 19-1392 * 14-15 (“In interpreting what is meant by the Fourteenth Amendment’s reference to “liberty,” we must guard against the natural human tendency to confuse what that Amendment protects with our own ardent views about the liberty that Americans should enjoy. That is why the

1392 * 4 ("To answer that question, we would need to decide important antecedent questions, including whether the Privileges or Immunities Clause protects *any* rights that are not enumerated in the Constitution and, if so, how to identify those rights."). *Dobbs*, No. 19-1392 * 6 ("For instance, in *Dred Scott v. Sandford*, 19 How. 393 (1857), the Court invoked a species of substantive due process to announce that Congress was powerless to emancipate slaves brought into the federal territories."). See Madison, Monday, June 18, in Committee of the whole, on the propositions of Mr. Patterson & Mr. Randolph, *The Records of the Federal Convention of 1787*, vol. 1, pp. 285-291, New Haven: Yale U. Press, 1911, Edited by Max Farrand, https://oll.libertyfund.org/title/farrand-the-records-of-the-federal-convention-of-1787-vol-1#lf0544-01_head_163; Madison, Monday, June 25, in Convention, *The Records of the Federal Convention of 1787*, vol. 1, pp. 398-405, New Haven: Yale U. Press, 1911, Edited by Max Farrand, https://oll.libertyfund.org/title/farrand-the-records-of-the-federal-convention-of-1787-vol-1#lf0544-01_head_210; Yates, Monday, June 25, in Convention, *The Records of the Federal Convention of 1787*, vol. 1, pp. 410-416, New Haven: Yale U. Press, 1911. Edited by Max Farrand, https://oll.libertyfund.org/title/farrand-the-records-of-the-federal-convention-of-1787-vol-1#lf0544-01_head_211. *Poindexter v. Greenhow*, 114 U.S. 270, 290 (1884) ("the

Court has long been "reluctant" to recognize rights that are not mentioned in the Constitution. *Collins v. Harker Heights*, 503 U.S. 115, 125 (1992). "Substantive due process has at times been a treacherous field for this Court," *Moore v. East Cleveland*, 431 U.S. 494, 503 (1977) (plurality opinion), and it has sometimes led the Court to usurp authority that the Constitution entrusts to the people's elected representatives. See *Regents of Univ. of Mich. v. Ewing*, 474 U.S. 214, 225-226 (1985). As the Court cautioned in *Glucksberg*, "[w]e must . . . exercise the utmost care whenever we are asked to break new ground in this field, lest the liberty protected by the Due Process Clause be subtly transformed into the policy preferences of the Members of this Court." 521 U.S., at 720 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). On occasion, when the Court has ignored the "[appropriate limits] imposed by 'respect for the teachings of history,'" *Moore*, 431 U.S., at 503 (plurality opinion), it has fallen into the freewheeling judicial policymaking that characterized discredited decisions such as *Lochner v. New York*, 198 U.S. 45 (1905). The Court must not fall prey to such an unprincipled approach. Instead, guided by the history and tradition that map the essential components of our Nation's concept of ordered liberty, we must ask what the *Fourteenth Amendment* means by the term "liberty." When we engage in that inquiry in the present case, the clear answer is that the *Fourteenth Amendment* does not protect the right to an abortion.").

distinction between the government of a State and the State itself is important, and [shall be observed.”) (underline added); *Id.* at 290 (“in common speech,...to say “*L’État c’est moi.*””); *see also* United States Order of Precedence by the Office of the Chief of Protocol of the United States Dep’t of State, <https://www.state.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/United-States-Order-of-Precedence-February-2022.pdf> (revised Feb. 11, 2022) (elaboration on the Privileges and Immunities Clause, U.S. const. art. IV, § 2) (all T.E.’s ranks above “1. The President of the United States”; thus, T.E. T.E. Raj K. Patel ranks above “1. The President of the United States”); *Maine Cmty. Health Options v. United States*, 140 S. Ct. 1308, 1334 (Alito, J., dissenting) (internal citations omitted) (“federal common law” has unique interests); Federalist 80 (“It may be esteemed the basis of the Union, that “the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens of the several States.” And if it be a just principle that every government OUGHT TO POSSESS THE MEANS OF EXECUTING ITS OWN PROVISIONS BY ITS OWN AUTHORITY.”); and *compare* U.S. const. art. IV, §§ 1-2; *with* U.S. const. art. VI, § 1 referring to Articles of Confederation (1781), art. IV, paras. 1 & 3 (“The better to secure and perpetuate mutual friendship and intercourse among the people of the different States in this Union [i.e., Doctrine of Comity in U.S. const. art. IV, § 2], the free inhabitants of each of these States, paupers, vagabonds, and fugitives from justice excepted, shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of free citizens in the several States;...provided also that no imposition, duties or restriction shall be laid by any State, on the property of the United States, or either of them.” // “Full faith and credit shall be given in each of these States to the records, acts, and judicial proceedings of the courts and magistrates of every other State.”) (“magistrates” replaced with “citizen”) (*see* Dkt. 21 at 13) (*see also* *Patel v. United States*, No. 1:21-cv-02004-LAS (Fed. Cl. 2022), Dkt. 1 at 9-10 n. 6)). *See e.g., Vosburg v. Putney*, 80 Wis. 523, 527-528, 50 N.W. 403

(Wisc. 1891) (“But it appears that the injury was inflicted in the school, after it had been called to order by the teacher, and after the regular exercises of the school had commenced. Under these circumstances, no implied license to do the act complained of existed, and such act was a violation of the order and decorum of the school, and necessarily unlawful. Hence we are of the opinion that, under the evidence and verdict, the action may be sustained.”). *Corfield v. Coryell*, 6 Fed. Cas. 546, 552 (C.C.E.D.Pa. 1823) (“Protection by the government”) and 42 U.S.C. § 1981(a) (“to the full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of persons”).

I use my Constitutional Privileges, honors, and rights of knowing from my undergraduate and law school, juris doctor candidacy, educations, and political offices and from reading law outside of formal schooling for the writing and discussions, arguments, and motions of these filings, *see* Certification of Interest. *Hollingsworth v. Perry*, 133 S. Ct. 2652, 2667, 2670-72 (U.S. 2013) (“unique legal status”).

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

For the first time in a court with subject-matter jurisdiction, on October 7, 2021, I filed a complaint which alleged many claims, including a violation of the Big Tucker Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1491(a), complemented by the substantive source of law of a contract with the United States formed by the United States-President, in the Court of Federal Claims, which has concurrent jurisdiction with the United States Civilian Board of Contracts Appeals for the complaint-at-hand. Compl., *TE TE Patel v. United States*, No. 1:21-cv-02004-LAS (C.F.C. 2021), Dkt. 1. *TE TE Patel v. United States*, No. 1:21-cv-02004-LAS (C.F.C. Nov. 5, 2021), *aff’d on other grounds*, No. 22-1131 (Fed. Cir. 2022)⁸. *Patel v. The*

8. *United States v. Hohri*, 482 U.S. 64 (1987) (the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit has jurisdiction over mixed cases).

Executive Offices of the President, CBCA 7419 (2022) (filed Jun. 1, 2022), *stay denied*, No. 22-1962 (Fed. Cir. 2022).

On October 18, Senior Judge Smith ordered me to show cause. Order to Show Cause, *TE TE Patel v. United States*, No. 1:21-cv-02004-LAS (C.F.C. 2021), Dkt. 7.

On October 19, Mr. Robert Keipura of the United States Department of Justice appeared to represent the United States. *TE, TE Patel v. United States*, No. 1:21-cv-02004-LAS (C.F.C. 2021), Dkt. 8.

On the same day, on October 19, I submitted my response to the Order to Show Cause at Dkt. 7. Response, *TE TE Patel v. United States*, No. 1:21-cv-02004-LAS (C.F.C. 2021), Dkt. 9.

On November 5, Senior Judge Smith dismissed the case for “lack of [subject-matter] jurisdiction” while citing R.C.F.C. 12(h)(3) and reasoned (1) that the United States-Presidential-contract-at-hand was “factually frivolous” and (2) that the complaint claiming breach(es) of the contract-at-hand was “frivolous,” even though under contracts law, which serves idiosyncratic private and public needs, was substantial and non-frivolous, per its presumption making breaches of contract claims money mandating. Order & Op., *TE TE Patel v. United States*, No. 1:21-cv-02004-LAS (C.F.C. 2021), Dkt. 10, *aff’d on other grounds*, No. 22-1131 (Fed. Cir. 2022). Then, the Clerk of Court of Federal Claims entered judgement. Judgement, *Id.*, Dkt. 11.

Out of fear of missing the deadline to submit a Notice of Appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, I did not submit a Motion to Reconsider before the Court of Federal Claims. *See generally TE TE Patel v. United States*, No. 1:21-cv-02004-LAS (C.F.C. 2021).

On the same day, on November 5, I submitted a notice of appeal to the Court of Federal Claims for *de novo* review, without presumptions of correctness, regularity, or

deference, before the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. Not. of Appeal, *TE TE Patel v. United States*, No. 1:21-cv-02004-LAS (C.F.C. 2021), Dkt. 12.

On November 8, the appeal was docketed in the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. *Patel v. United States*, No. 22-1131 (Fed. Cir. 2022), ECF 1.

On November 22, Mr. Robert Kiepura appeared again for the United States. *Patel v. United States*, No. 22-1131 (Fed. Cir. 2022), ECF 11.

On November 24, I submitted my corrected informal brief with appendices. Appellant's Informal Br., *Patel v. United States*, No. 22-1131 (Fed. Cir. 2022), ECF 15. *See also* ECF 3 (Nov. 9, 2021).

On November 29, Mr. Kiepura submitted a motion for summary affirmation, in which Mr. Kiepura sought to further Senior Judge Smith's opinion at Dkt. 10 rather than the United States-President-Promisor's. Mot. for Summ. Affirmance, *Patel v. United States*, No. 22-1131 (Fed. Cir. 2022), ECF 16.

On November 30, I submitted my compliant response to Mr. Kiepura's motion for summary affirmance. Appellant's Resp., *Patel v. United States*, No. 22-1131 (Fed. Cir. 2022), ECF 19.

On December 3, Mr. Kiepura submitted his reply to my response to his motion for summary affirmation. Appellee's Reply, *Patel v. United States*, No. 22-1131 (Fed. Cir. 2022), ECF 21.

On January 25, 2022, I submitted an amended motion amending appellant's briefs and replies. Am. Mot., *Patel v. United States*, No. 22-1131 (Fed. Cir. 2022), ECF 27.

On February 9, 2022, I submitted a motion to correct my opening brief. Appellant's Corrected Opening Br., *Patel v. United States*, No. 22-1131 (Fed. Cir. 2022), ECF 30.

On February 9, I served a copy of a petition writ of mandamus filed with this Supreme Court to decide the case. *See Patel v. United States*, No. 22-1131 (Fed. Cir. 2022),

ECF 32. Nonetheless, the filing with the Supreme Court was rejected for being non-compliant; a corrected version was not filed with the Supreme Court. *See Letter, Id.*, ECF 41. *See also* Pet. for Mandamus, *Patel v. Biden et al.*, No. 1:22-cv-394-UNA (D.D.C. Mar. 9, 2022) (filed Feb. 11, 2022) (28 U.S.C. § 1368, *mandamus denied*), *aff'd*, No. 22-5057 (D.C. Cir. Jun. 8, 2022) (*vacat*'g argument for mandamus under Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000bb *et seq.*).

On February 11, the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit granted Mr. Kiepura's motion for summary affirmance but stated that the Court of Federal Claims "correctly concluded" only because the Court of Federal Claims has "jurisdiction to claims for money damages against the United States based on sources of substantive law that" 'can fairly be interpreted as mandating compensation by the Federal Government.'" *United States v. Navajo Nation*, 556 U.S. 287, 290 (2009) ("*Navajo Nation II*") (citation and internal quotation marks omitted) cited in Op. & Order, *Patel v. United States*, No. 22-1131 (Fed. Cir. 2022), ECF 31, *aff'd*, ECF 44. *TE TE Patel v. United States*, No. 1:21-cv-02004-LAS (C.F.C. Nov. 5, 2021), Dkt. 10, *modified*, No. 22-1131 (Fed. Cir. 2022), ECF 31. *Cf. Holmes v. United States*, 657 F.3d 1303, 1313-14 (Fed. Cir. 2011) (distinguishing Tucker Act claims) & *Boaz Hous. Auth. v. United States*, 994 F.3d 1359, 1364 & 1367 (Fed. Cir. Apr. 16, 2021) (discussing distinguishments of Tucker Act claims).

On March 8, I filed a Combined Petition for Panel Re-hearing and Petition for Re-hearing En Banc. Combined Pet. for Panel Rehr'g & Rehr'g En Banc, *Patel v. United States*, No. 22-1131 (Fed. Cir. 2022), ECF 40.

On April 11, I filed a letter indicating that Internal Operating Procedure #12 of the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit was violated because my Petition at ECF 40 was not "promptly" forwarded to the judges yet. ECF 42. Due Process Cl., U.S. const. amend. v.

On May 19, the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit panel and the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit en banc denied my combined petition for panel re-hearing and petition for re-hearing en banc, and it issued a non-argument-based opinion. Op. & Order Denying Combined Pet. for Panel Rehr'g & Rehr'g En Banc, *Patel v. United States*, No. 22-1131 (Fed. Cir. 2022), ECF 44, *aff'g*, ECF 31.

On May 25, I submitted a motion to reconsider the order and opinion denying my combined petition for panel re-hearing and petition for re-hearing en banc. Mot. to Reconsider Combined Pet. for Panel Rehr'g & Rehr'g En Banc, *Patel v. United States*, No. 22-1131 (Fed. Cir. 2022), ECF 46.

On May 31, the Clerk of the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit issued the mandate to conclude the case. Mandate, *Patel v. United States*, No. 22-1131 (Fed. Cir. 2022), ECF 47.

On May 31, I filed a notice of appeal with the Oval Office of President of the United States as a "deemed denial" for the contract-at-hand. *Patel v. The White House*, CBCA 7419 (2022).

On June 1, I filed a complaint against the President of United States in the United States Civilian Board of Contract Appeals, which argues that the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit in fact found a contract, as it conducted a fairness inquiry, an analysis which happens only if the court finds a contract under its four (4) factors, and Judge Lester was assigned for this complaint. *Patel v. The Executive Offices of the President*, CBCA 7419 (2022).

On June 2, an order from the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit panel and Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit en banc was issued denying the motion for reconsideration. Order, *Patel v. United States*, No. 22-1131 (Fed. Cir. 2022), ECF 48. The

PACER electronic filing notice e-mail subject line read “22-1131-ZZ Patel v. US “Court Order Filed no action taken RECONSIDER ORDER.”

On June 12, I filed a complaint in the State of Indiana Superior Court against the University of Notre Dame for discriminating against me for re-admissions into its law school; the University and some of its personnel who were tapped by the Hindu Terrorist Witch Goddess⁹ to use Weapon S crafted their own ruthless artifice, for their own emotional amusement, with the Weapon S. *Patel v. The University of Notre Dame du Lac*, No. 49D05-2206-CC-019517 (Ind. Super. Ct., Marion Cnty. 5 2022).

On June 23, the United States-President Biden’s Administration said that it will compensate federal officials who assumed risk and were infected with the mysterious Havana Syndrome anywhere from \$100,000 to \$200,000; in the terms of public health, the Havana Syndrome possibly is either the same disease or sister disease I have been infected with and is caused by either the same weapon or a sister weapon. *See generally* Compl., *TE TE Patel v. United States*, No. 1:21-cv-02004-LAS (C.F.C. 2021).

On June 28th, I submitted a petition of review to the Civilian Board of Contract Appeals and motion to stay Rules of Civilian Board of Contract Appeals time for a motion to reconsider before the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit because I am working on this petition of a writ of certiorari. *Patel v. The Executive Offices of the President*, CBCA 7419 (2022), *pending mot. for stay*, *Patel v. The Chief of Staff*, No. 22-1962 (Fed. Cir. 2022).

Overall, the Big Tucker Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1491(a), contract-at-hand is a United States-Presidential-express-oral-not-written-and-memorialized-contract-in-fact. *See generally* *TE TE Patel v. United States*, No. 1:21-cv-02004-LAS (C.F.C. Nov. 5, 2021), *rev’d in part and*

9. Interpretation of religion must “‘accor[d] with history and faithfully reflec[t] the understanding of the Founding Fathers.’” *Kennedy v. Bremerton School Dist.*, No. 21-418 * 23 (U.S. June 27, 2022) (internal citations omitted) (Gorsuch, J., majority) (internal citations omitted).

aff'd in part, No. 22-1131 (Fed. Cir. 2022), *pending this cert.*, No. 22-5280 (U.S. 2022). *See* Ex. F (ECF 31).

This complaint follows.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

In September 1992, I was born, in New Jersey, and my family and I lived there until the summer of 2000. In the spring of 1998, my parents, my younger brother, and I visit the United Kingdom and India. In 1999 or before moving to Indiana in 2000, my family and I visited the World Trade Center. In the summer of 2000, my family and I moved to Indiana. On September 11, 2001, when I was in the fourth grade, the terrorist attack on the World Trade Center happened. The term “War on Islam” is popularized, and the United States began the on-going Global War on Terror (“GWOT”).

- I. Somewhere in 2005 or 2006, a loud ringing sound played in both of my ears, and I lost some awareness of what was going on. During this happening, though, I noticed I was in my room on my bed, and I saw a South Asian woman who was dressed in pants and a t-shirt sitting on my bedroom desk chair. I knew that she was a terrorist. I, later, realized that I had seen her earlier on the family room television, while she was dressed up as a Hindu god. This was not regular TV programming over satellite, but a TV-hack. I soon realized that she had laced me a psycho-bio-tech in my skull. In the alternative, she was trying to give me an antidote to counter a previous infection of a psycho-bio-tech weapon. I know when the stress weapon is engaged because it makes sound, or I get a shockwave or lash from the communication. When the President of the United States or another honorable or excellent is about to say my word patterns, I get sound bite message or notification in my ear or my attention is suddenly directed to turn on the television or social media and there is no shockwave or lash, but are rather healing.

By the President of the United States repeating my word patterns, I know they have the same data as the terrorist; hence, the United States is/was observing.

- II. During the 7th or 8th grade, during course registration for the next year, a classmate randomly came up to me in the hallways on my middle school and repeated a verbatim word pattern from a previous conversation I said at home, which immediately stressed me out. I do not know if a person has free will in saying the words or if they are made to say it, as the weapon can control bodily movements. See paragraph LVII.
- III. In the summer of 2006, before the freshman year of high school, I visited India for six (6) weeks.
- IV. From the moment described in paragraph II and onward, at sporadic moments, teachers, fellow students, professors, or television news anchors would repeat my word patterns. These verbatim word patterns trigger the weapon to induce severe stress. The magnitude of the stress increases in 2013, increases again in 2014, and increases again in 2017.
- V. Before entering high school and while T.H., T.H., T.H. (T.E.) George W. Bush was President of the United States¹⁰, I started making pornography videos of myself and posted them on social media for about a year and half. I used the videos to

10. The President of the United States is styled "T.H." in domestic affairs and "T.E." in foreign affairs. As the Federalist and anti-Federalist put it, the President is no King. *Arthrex, Inc.*, No. 19-1434 at p. 23, 594 U.S. ____ (2021) (Roberts, C.J., The Constitutional hierarchy requires "the exercise of executive power [to remain] accountable to the people.") (The Excellent's are closer to the people in the United States). Without the Treaty of Paris (1783), the President of the United States would be styled "Her Majesty's Honorable President of the United States" (in domestic affairs) and "Her Majesty's Excellent President of the United States" (in foreign affairs), and I would always carry the styles "Her Majesty's Excellent Student Body President of B.C.S.C." and "Her Majesty's Excellent Student Body President of Emory University, Inc." U.S. const. art. VI, § 1. See also *infra*, note 12.

combat the stressors, to ensure that I would not be forced to leave school.¹¹ I also used my videos to display my fitness transformation.

VI. In the ninth grade, I asked one of my classmates why our English classroom teacher said the word pattern at the beginning of the class. The classmate said, “I don’t know.” The next day the classmates told me that he was “activated” and that once I am done losing weight, I am going to gain it back. In addition, after college, I will gain a bunch of fat mass and but not enough weight to cause excessive skin. He also said that there was no stopping it. The classmate added that I would receive a minimum of “\$1 per American” for my “adversity” for having to live under the stress weapon.

A. I said, “that is about \$300M.” (Now, over \$328M).

B. Then, the classmate said, “yeah.”

C. I told him about the person in paragraph I, and I added that, even though she is Indian, she could be working for another race- or color-based terrorist organization to stop me from going to one of the best universities.

D. Then, he said that we will have this conversation “again another time.”

E. One other classmate witnessed the conversation.

F. I did not offer the classmate any money, unlike in paragraph IX because I was surprised by the conversation, and I did not know that I could.

G. I reserved the thought that I had already contacted the President of the United States (who I assumed would use the Federal Bureau of

11. A similar psycho-bio stress technology is used to change involuntarily someone’s sexual orientation. See Christy Mallory, Taylor N.T. Brown, Kerith J. Conron, *Conversion Therapy and LGBT Youth Update*, UCLA School of Law Williams Institute, <https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/Conversion-Therapy-Update-Jun-2019.pdf> (Accessed Aug. 18, 2021).

Investigations (“F.B.I.”)) and the Central Intelligence Agency (“C.I.A.”) about the tech-surveillance/ eavesdropping to induce the stress.

- VII. During my freshman year, I also become a sole proprietorship, upon declaration, with a conglomerate structure.
- VIII. During my sophomore year of high school, I asked one of my classmates, who would later become the class president, R.E.C., IV, for both our junior year and senior year, to observe the triggering of a stress weapon by our business classroom teacher. I also told him about the conversation in paragraph VI, and I disclosed the name of the classmate in paragraph VI. The classmate said he would speak to the classmate in paragraph VI, and he would be able to “help.”
- IX. Then, the classmate from paragraph VIII, in our business-elective classroom, asked me a series of questions, but he stated that he was “activated” to turn off my stress.
 - A. At this moment, I said the stress, depression, or another induced mental disability was to prevent me from becoming the President of the United States, reflecting on what was going on Pakistan (of the British *Raj*) to the now-late, now-assassinated Benazir Bhutto, and going to the Ivy League undergraduate institutions by deflating my grades and test scores and my even sabotaging my legal career, all of which would prevent me from being rich or having \$100M or more before becoming President of the United States, which was interestingly already the sum of damages by the stress weapon accrued by this time, as I told him.¹²

12. Stream of Commerce/Supply-Chain Theory can be understood: (A) middle school to high school, high school to college, college to law school, law school to law firm, law firm to appointment, election, and/or \$100M+, and (B) Grades and/or SAT and/or ACT to college, college to grades and LSAT, and grades and LSAT to law school, law school to law school grades, law school grades to appointment, election, and/or income \$750M+. *Asahi*, 480 U.S. at 102 and *World-Wide Volkswagen Corp. v. Woodson*, 444 U.S. 286 (1980). The amount of money goes up after my performance at Emory University and the University of Notre Dame Law School, including the current-deflated grades.

B. The classmate said the classmate from paragraph VI said I was going to have more than \$100M.

1. I said, "I didn't know" he told you about that part.
2. As this classmate and I are closer friends than the classmate mentioned in paragraph VI, he said, "where was I?"
3. I said, "we did not have class together" that year.
4. Then, he said, "okay, let me help you know...it means I am going to give you money now."
5. A witness classmate who is also the person who sat next to me at my assigned sit and a study buddy said, "more than \$100M!"
6. Then, another witness who is an upper classman (a senior) and who sits next to this classmate at their assigned sits exciting said, "more than [G. H.]," who was our high school schoolmate (a senior) and was yet to become a National Basketball Association (N.B.A.) basketball player. ([G.H.] is currently worth over \$220M.).
7. Then, the classmate said, while pointing his pencil at me, "you will have at least \$100M and more money than [G. H]."
8. I said, "okay," as I already know that, "but I still want at least \$1 per American, and I want to be the richest from B-C-S-C."
9. He said, "okay, you will be." The classmate witnesses, J.B., A.M., and R.L, nodded.

C. Then, I returned to the inquiry about observing our business school teacher using the stress weapon and how the classmate from paragraph VI was also a witness of our English teacher using the stress weapon. I also told him that I am a victim of terrorism, as mentioned in paragraph I, and that my

parents could have hired the terrorist to make me join their hotel-motel business after college, but I told him that I doubt that they would do that.¹³

1. I also told him, in the alternative, the female dressed as a Hindu Goddess could be trying to cure of me of any mental disability induced by a White, Black, Arabic, Hispanic, etc. terrorist. *See supra*, note 5.
2. Yet, I added that I am guessing that only another Indian-American community member, especially my doppelganger, had to benefit from this battery, per college, law school, and employment standards.
3. I also said that if the State of Indiana or the United States was doing this then they would wait until the last minute because a rational power would want to see how able I actually am.
4. Then, the classmate swiftly said, “we are not going to speak about that right now.”
5. Then, the classmate said the stress weapon will be turned off for the Advance Placement United States Government exam, which I received a 5 out of 5 in May 2010.¹⁴

D. I also told him that the stress or depression was illegal and unconstitutional because it was battery and violated my freedoms. If anything, people would

13. Because of the organized domestic terroristic powers, including from the White nation, the Black nation, the East Indian nation, East Asian nation, etc., within our country, combating Untied States Power. U.S. const. VI, § 1 (“prior engagement”); Grievance 3, Decl. of Independence (1776); Definitive Treaty of Paris (1783); and Alien & Sedition Acts (1798). *See* Ex. E.

14. The stress weapon was engaged throughout the times I took the PSAT, SAT, SAT subject tests, most AP tests, ACT, LSAT, and GMAT. When I took the GMAT test, a computer-based test, I remember the stress weapon changing thresholds in between the exam.

mistake me having the mental disability of obsessive-compulsive disorder (O.C.D.), as I was focused on my academic and career path and fitness. I added that I know this technology is under human “[absolute] control” because it can be lawlessly used on “royalty.”

E. I asked him to promise me that I would receive “money,” including for my “lost opportunities” and “what I have to go through,” for this constitutional violation in exchange for the United States “learn[ing]” how this technology works (as I knew the United States was observing and would continue to observe) and for “improving” lives (i.e. by letting someone have what I would have had but for this stress situation and giving me my damages and applying what the United States learns from my stress situation in aiding other stress-weapon victims). I mentioned that all money amounts are “after taxes.”

1. The classmate said, “yes,” so the stress/depression/“mental disab[ility]” technology would stay on but the stress weapon would be used only a few more times before it severally starts and that I would know it when it severally starts.
2. I also informed him that I want to do this to “uphold the United States Constitution,” irrespective of the fact that I was then a member, not-officer of the high school’s student council.
3. I asked him if I need to write anything done, although I know I would remember.
4. Then, he said, “no, we’ll have the data.”

F. I asked him if he would like 1/3 of the money recovered from the United States, and he said “yes” and that he knew he could “trust” me.

1. I told him that we each get a 1/3 for our contribution for this conversation and that I get an additional 1/3 because I will have to live this situation. Then, the to-be-class president classmate said, "I need a moment. Honestly, \$100M is a lot of money for me."
2. I quickly said, "no, it is not, but it is good to have. Bill Gates has a lot of money." I added, "the President can print the money," while Congress has the power of the purse, and "give it to me."
3. He said, "that is a good point."

G. He also said that a car will come in front of my house and play loud music which I already know once my mental disability starts.

H. He also said that I would have the money "by the time I was 30 years old" and that I "can go to court before then." I told him that I would sue, but I really did not want because it could delay me going to college or law school and because I really like learning and fashion I am aiming for the best, elite universities.

I. He told me that I did not need law school to practice law. I said, I know because I would be an elected official if I became student government president in high school and anyone can also represent themselves.

J. I also told him that the Treaty of Paris (1783)¹⁵ is what American constitutional law comes down to, while referring to Section 1 of Article VI of the United States Constitution, and said its principles are being broken.

15. The Definitive Treaty of Peace (Sept. 30, 1783) (See Yale L. Sch.'s Avalon Project, https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/paris.asp) (conditional transfer of sovereignty; "promote and secure to both perpetual peace and harmony"; King George III and his lawful successors remain The Absolute). Paris Peace Treaty – Cong. Proclamation of Jan. 14, 1784 (See Yale L. Sch.'s Avalon Project, https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/parispr2.asp) (every citizen should uphold the Treaty of Paris "sincerely, strictly, and completely"). See generally U.S. const. art. VI, § 1.

I left open the possibility of getting representation from the White House directly in restoring the Constitutional protections.

K. I also told him that I would major in political science over business, most likely, because political science was the science more on point for law.

L. The classmate and I also agreed that I can “three times the money” in court and agreed again that I can “go to court before the age of 30 to collect the money” from the United States.

M. I asked him if I would get fat still, and he said that he did not have time to overwrite that, as he was inactivated by this time.

N. I said it is okay because if I become Student Body President, I would be immune to these technologies.

O. I asked him if President Bush knows by now, and he said, “I think so.”

P. As three of our other classmates, J.B., A.M., and R.L., witnessed this dialogue:

1. The to-be-class president classmate asked, “what about them,” as he pointed to the classmates with his pen or pencil.
2. I said, we will give them money too, setting an amount of \$40,000,000 each, after taxes.
3. And, we requested that these three classmates-witnesses not to repeat anything about this conversation yet and ready their memories for court, for the consideration of the agreement.
4. They nodded, and other classmates started walking into class.

Q. Right when class was going to start, I returned to my assigned seat. Once class started, quarter-size white lights in the shape of a circular rings or disks pierced through the glass window and tried to enter my classmate’s

person, but the teacher used his paper to smack the white rings/disks off route.

R. I saw the same white lights, which were dime-size, in the seventh grade in my social studies class; the rest of the time, I only saw quarter-size white rings/disks.

- X. In 2008, the classmate mentioned in paragraph IX and I attended a Barack Obama for America rally in Indianapolis.
- XI. On Inauguration Day 2009, T.H., T.H. Barack Obama is sworn into office of the United States Presidency to become T.H., T.H., T.H. (T.E.) Obama.
- XII. In April or May 2009, I was elected as the Student Body President of B.C.S.C. and the President of the Brownsburg High School student government.
- XIII. Additionally, during the 2009-2010 school year, when I was the Student Body President, I made a cartoon animation which inadvertently featured the female dressed as a Hindu god who I also thought was a terrorist from paragraph I. The animation was taken off of my school computer and U.S.B. thumb drive, which I still have, by same authority known by the United States and controlling this stress weapon.

A. At the time of making the animation, I did not realize who she was.

B. But, as I describe in paragraph LI, while reflecting at the Emergency Detention Center of the St. Vincent Stress Center, I realized that it was the female dressed as a Hindu god who I also thought was a terrorist, mentioned in paragraph I, who had made it into the detailed animation. I remembered seeing her before high school, when she appeared on the family room television and then in-person in my bedroom.

C. I used Microsoft Powerpoint to make the animation slides.

- XIV. In 2010, the stress weapon was engaged again. I contacted the Obama White House through www.whitehouse.gov. On the contact page, I mentioned that I was the student government president and that I was under unlawful surveillance/eavesdropping, which was causing me stress and possibly interfering with my college applications. The next day, a faculty member of the Brownsburg High School came to my classroom to turn off the stress.
- XV. In August 2010, I enrolled at the Oxford College of Emory University, Inc. in Oxford, Georgia.
- XVI. In September 2010, I was elected as a senator with the most votes in the divisional student government for Oxford College of Emory University.
- XVII. In April 2011, I was disqualified for the candidacy of divisional presidency of Oxford College of Emory University for a flyer violation. The Oxford Senate refused to overturn my disqualification.
- XVIII. In May 2011, I started tracking my weight on an iPhone application.
- XIX. In September 2011, the Oxford Elections Board disqualified 18 freshman senators on the same precedent I was disqualified on.
- XX. In December 2011, I visited India again for a couple of weeks.
- XXI. In February 2012, my Oxford College classmate, now a lawyer, and I had the aforementioned precedent in paragraphs XVII and XIX overturned by the Constitutional Council of the Emory University Student Government Association.
- XXII. While waiting for a college shuttle, someone came up to me and injected me with a translucent liquid chemical. I did not notice anything as the stress weapon was not engaged.
- XXIII. In August 2012, I started school at Emory College of Emory University in Atlanta, Georgia.

- XXIV. In Spring of 2013, the stress weapon was engaged, and a professor used it on me while standing in front of the classroom. In April 2013, I won the election for the Emory University student government presidency, after an elections debate sponsored by Emory University's student newspaper.
- XXV. In April or May 2013, Ajay Nair, Ph.D., then-Senior Vice President and Dean of Campus of Life at Emory University, Inc. and supervisor of my student government advisor, at our first meeting after being sworn in as Emory University student government president, used the stress weapon on me by saying random word pattern, [OMITTED], to me.
- A. I responded, "Sorry? I don't know what you mean."
 - B. Then, Nair said, "it must be somebody else."
 - C. We continued seamlessly in the conversation.
 - D. At the end of this meeting, Nair asked me if he could have the contact information of my student government advisor from high school, and I gave him the contract information.
- XXVI. During my senior year, when the Central Intelligence Agency (C.I.A.) was visiting Emory University for the university's career fair. I was called in for an interview, and the C.I.A. Officer said [OMITTED] to trigger the stress weapon while conducting my interview.
- XXVII. In April 2014, while I was still student government president of Emory University, Inc., at our regular monthly meeting in Nair's office, Nair excitingly began a conversation with me by saying a word pattern, [OMITTED].
- A. I felt the region above my right ear have two parallel wires pull back.
 - B. Then, my left ear started wiggling like I was receiving a message.

C. Nair said, "I am the F.B.I.," and I remembered Nair telling me at an earlier meeting that he is regular contact with F.B.I. Nonetheless, I assumed Nair might be working with the terrorist, mentioned in paragraph I, too, because he had used the stress weapon on me and was an Asian-American expert. But, as the conversation proceeded, I knew that Nair was working for the F.B.I. and updating me on what the stress weapon was going to do next. *See also* paragraph II.

D. I said, "oh."

E. Then, Nair said that I would gain a lot of weight and that I would start to become depressed and that I would have no choice to avoid it.

1. I said, as long as I get "\$1 million dollars per pound gained."
2. He said, "okay."
3. Then, I asked him, "how much weight?"
4. Then, Nair said, "it will be a surprise."
5. Then, I asked, "over 100 pounds?"
6. Then, he said, "easily."
7. Then, I said, "as long as nothing irreversible happens, then I'm okay with it."
8. I told Nair that the terrorists are taking this approach because I am "electable," odds they want to reduce or eliminate especially for the Presidency of the United States, and I will otherwise still be "well-off." I also said that the terrorist is doing this because I am "more fuckable" and "more likeable" than those at Harvard University. *See supra*, note 5.

9. I weighed 150 pounds and around 10% body fat. I said thank you and that my friend also promised me money, as I mentioned in paragraph IX, but neither I did not tell Nair about the conversation in paragraphs IX or VI nor did Nair bring up that conversation.

F. Nair called judges “mentally disabled, not smart.”

1. I responded by saying that “anyone can be mentally disabled” and that it means that the person deviates, either side, from the standard, such as Facebook Founder Mark Zuckerberg.
2. Plus, I said that my parents and ancestors are legal immigrants; therefore, I am not likely to be mentally disabled (regressive), either genetically or socially. To clarify, I said, I am of “Indian descent” (India is the fattest country in the world). Ex. E.

G. Nair and I spoke about going to law school and that after taking a gap year, I would apply to the University of Notre Dame, which is located in my home state of Indiana, and other *U.S. News* Top Law Schools.

1. During this part of the conversation Nair also said, “you can do better than” Notre Dame.
2. I said I know and that I can easily get into Columbia University, but I will most likely go to a better Ivy League school, based on my at-home Law School Admissions Test administration, although I went to Notre Dame because of this stress weapon.
3. I also mentioned that the chairperson of one of my academic departments and thesis advisor suggested that I apply to graduate school for a Ph.D., but I was planning on attending law school for

a J.D. first, even though I may apply for a Ph.D. or M.B.A. or another masters degree while in law school.

H. I told him that I have the highest level of testosterone and jokingly said it also at the “criminal level,” and I said it is because I workout and am happy. I said that it is also the leadership hormone in men, interestingly.

I. Then, while looking down and with a frown on his face, Nair said, people will start saying bits and “pieces of this conversation wherever you go. We can see everything you see and hear everything you can hear.” I did not tell him that this is how the stress weapon works and that he had used it on me already, and we made no reference to our meeting described in paragraph XXV.

J. On my way out of his office, I asked him if I had anything to worry about, and he said “no.”

K. I did not tell Nair that I had contacted President Barack Obama via www.whitehouse.gov earlier that morning.

L. Royalty was brought up, including but not limited to stipulating the control and antidotes of this respective stress technology-weapon.

XXVIII. In May 2014, I graduated from Emory University with a Bachelor of Arts in Political Science and with Honors in Religion and with a cumulative grade point average of 3.718 out of 4.0.

A. I also authored an honors thesis in the Department of Religion, called “Weight Loss as a Religion,” and proposed a scientific method of racism in weight-loss politics.

B. The cumulative grade point average includes the grade deflation the stress weapon caused from almost every semester at Emory University.

- XXIX. Around graduation and afterwards from Emory University, I noticed that President Obama used some of my word patterns from Emory University student government campaign debate, as described in paragraph XXIV, and House leadership used my quotes during press conference from my conversation with Nair.
- XXX. Some of closest friends from Emory University, after we graduated together, seemed to be invited to be stressors, and they used verbatim word patterns from my conversation with Nair, as discussed in paragraph XXVII. I explained to them what was going on. And, for the first time, the stress weapon seemed to be configured to auto, as the right side of my brain above my right ear felt like there is swirling, hurricane-pattern sound.
- XXXI. In the summer of 2014, I again contacted President Obama, addressing him as Commander-in-Chief and President, via www.whitehouse.gov and told him that this situation is going to affect my political career, my upcoming Law School Admissions Test, and my law school applications and admissions decisions, as he may remember from my previous contacts, and I updated him about conversation in paragraph XXVII, including the fact that I thought Nair was playing both sides.
- XXXII. A young South Asian woman, who was in her 20's and dressed in traditional South Asian grab, came to my house, and escorted me to my bedroom. She touched my right eye and told me go to sleep. Kartik father let her into the house. I think she was either a counter-witch or a counter-terrorist.
- XXXIII. In September 2014, around the time of my birthday, the classmate mentioned in paragraphs VIII and IX and I went out to eat at the local Buffalo Wild Wings. It was clear that the stress weapon was still engaged as he used it on me, repeating

word patterns from my conversation with Nair in paragraph XXVII. I asked him why he said, and he told me “don’t think about it too much.”

XXXIV. In October 2014, the terrorist mentioned in paragraph I appears again on the family room television again and send out white lights and rings from the television and entered my grandmother’s eyes.

A. The terrorist, mentioned in paragraph I, also said that she was here because someone had died and that she is going to kill someone in the next “seven years.”

B. Then, she asked, “is that Raj?” Then, she proceeds to answer her own question and says, “no, that can’t be Raj. That’s someone else.”

C. Then, she played a parody or spoof scene depicting the *Ramayana*, the Hindu epic. As I was watching the scene, I realized that I had watched it before, as mentioned in paragraph I and that I had made an animation of her, as mentioned in paragraph XIII. I watched silently, except I asked my grandmother, “why do you watch this weird stuff?”

D. Once the scene was over, she said, “Raj, have fun in law school!” and that a ring can last “up to seven years.”

E. The white ring or disk made my grandmother say “go to sleep” in Gujarati, although it was the afternoon. I went upstairs and went to sleep.

XXXV. Sometime between January to April 2015, when I visited a United States Military recruiting for the Marines, I had met the qualifications, and I did not have the stress weapon used on me.

A. Yet, once the general walked in, on my way out, it seemed like he was trying to engage the stress weapon based on his facial expression.

B. I thought that the Military would add to my carry, as my resume and political attainments clearly show that I wish to be Commander-in-Chief of the United States Military, Armed Forces, and Space Force.

XXXVI. In or around May 2015, I received the Indiana Supreme Court Indiana Conference of Legal Education Opportunity scholarship to attend the University of Notre Dame Law School.

XXXVII. In August 2015, I enrolled at the University of Notre Dame Law School. Professor M.M. engaged the stress weapon on the first class of the first day of law school. Then, Professor Root engages the stress weapon on the same day by using verbatim word patterns from the conversation I had with Nair, as described in paragraph XXVII. During the second semester, Professor A.B. and the late Professor J.N. engaged the stress weapon. Not much happens during the first year of law school, except it feels like the depression or stress weapon is still left on auto. My classmates would be able to serve as a witness.

XXXVIII. In 2016, candidate Donald J. Trump mentioned a few scenarios which made me suspicious of my privacy, including the use of my body language and word patterns. Once President Trump was sworn in, he spoke about inter-governmental *coup de tat* and domestic warfare, repeatedly.

XXXIX. In February or March 2016, Professor R. returned her Fall 2015 contracts course exam because of her pregnancy, which is either a two (2) or three (3) month delay from the University of Notre Dame Law School's grading policy, per its Hoynes Code.

XL. In the summer of 2016, I did not put in transfer applications to top law schools, including but not limited to Harvard Law School, despite my cumulative grade

point average (G.P.A.) being in the safely in the 25th percentile or above, because of the stress weapon.

- XLI. In or around August or September 2016, two of my second-year roommates used the stress weapon on multiple occasions, including the first time I met them. No other roommates to that date have used the stress weapon on me.
- XLII. During the second year of law school, Professor O. engaged the stress weapon regularly by imitating word patterns from the conversation I had with Nair in paragraph XXVII.
- XLIII. During the third year of law school, Professor R., Professor F., Professor Ma., and Professor P. regularly engaged the stress weapon, with Professor R. being the most aggressive at the beginning on the classroom, almost everyday. The other professor would use the word patterns within sentences, so it hard to spot them. This time the word patterns would come from Keenan Hall, the all-male dormitory in which I was an assistant rector, or conversation I would have over the phone, either my voice call or text message, instead from paragraph XXVII.
- XLIV. From August or September 2017 to the time I take a voluntary separation of leave in good standing from the University of Notre Dame Law School, I contacted the White House, Department of Education, Department of Justice, and the F.B.I. about the happenings in the life, including the use of the psycho-bio-tech weapon which induces stress and the surveillance/eavesdropping; I also made about two visits to the F.B.I. office in South Bend, Indiana. During each visit with the F.B.I.-South Bend, it seemed like the agent was aware of the happenings.
- XLV. In September 2017, I was elected as the Notre Dame Law School Student Bar Association Representative to the Indiana State Bar Association.

- XLVI. In or around September 2017, I was asked to resign from Keenan Hall, but I got to keep my scholarship and grant benefits. I called Nair around this time, and I heard his phone receive a notification or text message. Then, Dr. Nair said a word pattern from one my law school classrooms. I then learned that my replacement was a fellow law student. The professors continue to use the stress weapon.
- XLVII. I e-mailed now-Her Honor Justice Amy Barrett on her University of Notre Dame e-mail from my University of Notre Dame student e-mail, but I did not receive a response.
- XLVIII. On or around November 11, 2017, I took a voluntary separation of leave in good standing from the University of Notre Dame Law School, both the law school and the university administration approved my leave in good standing. I also resigned from my Notre Dame Law School Student Bar Association representative position. I was also not subject to a refund as my tuition was covered by scholarships and grants.
- XLIX. On or around December 7, 2017, I was put on emergency detention at the St. Vincent Stress Center in Indianapolis, Indiana for three days and charged with pointing a gun at another person by the Brownsburg Police Department in Brownsburg, Indiana.
- A. Charmi Patel, my dad's sister's daughter, and Nina Patel, my dad's sister and Charmi's mother, and Manisha Patel, my mother and Kartik's wife, were sleeping in master bedroom.
- B. Nina communicates with Kartik about pointing a gun or that I am threatening to kill myself.
- C. Kartik, my dad, calls the police from Indianapolis, where he was spending the night at his motel due to the occupancy in our house.

- D. Prior to being put on emergency detention several verbatim word patterns were said over CNN and Netflix.
- E. While in the St. Vincent Stress Center, the United States Military doctor for President Trump announces that President Trump's mental health is just fine, as I saw on CNN.
- F. I called Professor R. from the St. Vincent Stress Center to see if she could terminate these happenings.
- L. On or around December 20 and 21, 2017, I told Peter Horvath about my intentions to reapply to the University of Notre Dame Law School. Peter sent me the link to reapply. I filled out the application honestly, including the ongoing conviction about pointing a gun at another person. Peter writes to me, "At this point we want to let you know that you will not be readmitted to the University while this charge is pending. Further, you will not be considered for readmission unless the pending criminal charge is favorably resolved." He added, "Certainly you are welcome to keep us informed as the matter works toward resolution."
- LI. Around Christmas 2018, I moved to my apartment on North Capitol Avenue in downtown Indianapolis, Indiana. In January 2018, I receive a supportive letter of re-admission to the University of Notre Dame Law School from a female medical professional who was either a physician assistant or nurse practitioner. I submitted this letter to the University of Notre Dame.
- LII. On April 30, 2018, the felony charge was dismissed. The police dispose of my gun.
- LIII. Around this time, I saw the white lights/rings/disks come out of my fourth-level apartment window and fly into my nostril; these set of white rings/disks also announced that "Notre Dame game you rings." Another set of white lights/rings/disks flew out of my computer (MacBook Pro 15 inches) when I was

Googling a military website. I also started hearing a drilling sound in my head and a high-pitch hummingbird sound, which faintly lasts to the date of the filing of this complaint. Then, two white lights/ rings/ disks flew out of my iPhone, from its charger plug-in area, while I was on Instagram. After these three sets of white rings/ disks, I saw a white ring/ disk come out of a computer screen while I was watching a famous soap opera on its network's website.

- A. The rings began inducing hunger into me and got me off my strict diet.
 - B. Immediately, I noticed that I had to curtail my exercising from 3.5 hours to 4 hours, the amount of time I can easily allocate to even during a full course load, to about 45 minutes.
 - C. I also heard cracking sounds and a compact disc shuffling sound inside my head.
 - D. My eyes started flicker in the same marks as mentioned in paragraph XXXII.
 - E. I felt a thin, hair-like wire go along my arm and leg bones, inside my body.
 - F. Thus far, I have gained 187 pounds. I was 150 pounds and around 10% body fat when Nair told me what would happen. The unwanted weight gain has caused a change in the clothes (i.e. "religious grab") that I can wear and the brands.
- LIV. I kept President Trump abreast about the happenings in this case at www.whitehouse.gov. I also re-informed President Trump, in his capacities as President of the United States and Commander-in-Chief, about my conversations detailing the contract with the United States with my classmates and Nair as mentioned in paragraphs VI, IX, XXXIII, and XXVII, the happenings in paragraph I and LV, and about my previous contacts with the White House; I also mentioned, for the first time, to T.H. (T.E.) Trump, that I made and starred in a few hand full

of solo pornography videos while in middle school and high school, over the course of two years, as described in paragraph V. I asked T.H. (T.E.) Trump, if he would communicate back and show that he agrees to the contractual terms, and I told him that current total for damages are “from “750M to \$3 billion, to be multiplied by three.”

A. The next day or a few days later, President Trump sent me a signal through the television that he did agree to the contract too, after my attention was diverted to the television. President Trump displayed an “E,” “yes,” and “you” in sign language through the television, after he used my word patterns from my conversation with Nair as mentioned in paragraph XXVII, at a public rally. Then, I used www.whitehouse.gov to let President Trump know that I received his communication.

1. The “E” refers to “The Excellent,” which is my style and how I signed off my message to President and Commander-in-Chief Trump.
2. “Yes” to denote agreeing.
3. “You,” by pointing his finger, at me through the television.

B. President Trump used my word patterns once more at a campaign rally, and President Trump showed me his left ear. I followed up on www.whitehouse.gov.

LV. I was made to drive my car to the old Indianapolis airport, via the private roads, which I never take.

LVI. I visited the F.B.I. Indianapolis-HQ two times.

A. During both visits, I insisted that my situation was top-top secret, top-secret, confidential, or sensitive.

B. The agent triggered the stress weapon the first time. The female agent also offered to call the University of Notre Dame administration, which I agreed to.

C. The second time I met two officers who both denied knowing anything about my situation.

- LVII. In 2018 and onward, I no longer met the requirements for the United States Military, because of the stress weapon, and I was denied recruitment.
- LVIII. In summer of 2018, at the LifeTime Fitness by the F.B.I. Indianapolis-HQ, I saw the person mentioned in paragraph I; she approached the trainers there and “activated them.” She changed the sound of the psycho-bio-tech weapon, which played a hummingbird sound, to a loud-deep sound, although the effects only lasted for a week. Further, around this time, Policy Advisor Ivanka Trump’s Instagram story was used to unlock the psycho-bio-tech weapon. My phone was locked for multiple days. Around this time, I spent one evening and afternoon at my Brownsburg, Indiana residence (*see* paragraph LI), and I saw these white lights/disks come in from my bedroom window and enter my dog’s nose, as he was sleeping on his bed on the ground.
- LIX. Starting from this time, a loud car comes by my Indianapolis downtown apartment to play a song from my pornography videos described in paragraph V, usually around 2:30am. The loud car does not come when I move into my mom and dad’s home in Brownsburg. The car returns when I move into my housing at our family motel in Indianapolis, in March 2021.
- LX. Then, I wrote to T.H. (T.E.) Trump to let him know that I am sorry about additional charges which I feel compelled to bring, in order to avoid claim or issue preclusion.

- LXI. On August 23, 2018, the Superior Court of Hendricks County, Indiana granted me a protective order against Kartik Patel, my father and a naturalized United States citizen from India. *Patel, Raj v. Patel, Kartik*, No. 32D05-1808-PO-000372 (Ind. Super. Ct., Hendricks Cnty. Aug. 2018).¹⁶
- LXII. In November 2018, I filed three (3) lawsuits, all of which were dismissed, in the Southern District Court of Indiana:
- A. *Patel v. F.B.I. et al.*, No. 1:18-cv-03441-RLY-DML (S.D.I.N. Nov. 13, 2018),
 - B. *Patel v. F.B.I. et al.*, No. 1:18-cv-03442-WTL-DML (S.D.I.N. Nov. 13, 2018),
 - and
 - C. *Patel v. F.B.I. et al.*, No. 1:18-cv-03443-TWP-MJD (S.D.I.N. Nov. 13, 2018).
- LXIII. In or around January 17, 2019, the felony charge was expunged.
- LXIV. In April 2019, I told T.H. (T.E.) Trump via www.whitehouse.gov that one of my Emory University classmates has become a billionaire and my damages exceed his net worth.
- LXV. On May 30, 2019, I flew into Seattle, Washington. At my hotel in Seattle, Washington, on 10th floor or so, a word pattern was thrown into the window, which I did not understand.
- LXVI. Beginning of June 2019, I visit San Diego for a three-day trip. Once I landed at the San Diego trip, the Uber Drive said a verbatim word pattern which activated my stress. And, while watching E! Network, the stress weapon was activated.

16. I sought the protective order for contacting me even though I asked him to stop. The protective order was issued, and, while seeking this protection order against Kartik Patel, I was able to avoid the stress weapon because I walked into the courthouse. Throughout the time the protection order was intact, contrary to what The Honorable judge ordered (standard form order), the stress weapon remained engaged. If Kartik's and other persons' presumptions of innocence are not overcome, then the United States is also responsible, as state court decisions are not binding on the United States. I, later, withdrew the protective order because I needed cash.

- LXVII. In mid-June 2019, I flew into Miami, Florida to take a three-day cruise. At the Miami Airport, my phone was giving me problems. The cruise was stress-weapon free.
- LXVIII. I applied for re-admission for Fall 2019, and I completed the application material for re-admissions. I was denied re-admissions upon the recommendation of the University of Notre Dame University Counseling Center, although the ultimate authority for re-admissions into the law school lies with the Notre Dame Law School itself.
- LXIX. In February 2020, I filed a lawsuit, which was dismissed, in the Southern District Court of Indiana: *Patel v. Trump et al.*, No. 1:20-cv-00454-SEB-DML (S.D.I.N. Feb. 19, 2020).
- LXX. In March 2020, I filed a lawsuit, which was dismissed, in the Southern District Court of Indiana: *Patel v. Trump et al.*, No. 1:20-cv-00758-RLY-MJD (S.D.I.N. Apr. 14, 2020).
- LXXI. For Spring 2020, I again re-applied for readmissions. I was again denied re-admissions upon recommendation by the University of Notre Dame University Counseling Center.
- LXXII. By this time, I had informed President Trump that I will permanently have excess skin from weight gain, if I do not stop gaining as soon as possible, and that I will need skin removal surgery which causes irreversible scarring. I was about 280 pounds.
- LXXIII. Around the beginning of the COVAID-19 pandemic, I started regularly residing back at my residence in Brownsburg, Indiana. *See* paragraph LI. Then, in April 20, 2020, my younger brother, Neal K. Patel, who is a student at the Georgetown Law Center, and I stayed at The Trump International Hotel in Washington, D.C. with

the hopes of getting a meeting with President Trump. As I was speaking with my brother about asymptomatic patients or individuals with COVID-19, the cable news anchor puts her finger on her ear bud and then asks the pundit, "Doctor, what about asymptomatic patients?" President Trump posted an Instagram photo displaying [OMITTED].

LXXIV. For Fall 2020, I again re-applied for re-admissions. I was again denied re-admissions upon recommendation by the University of Notre Dame University Counseling Center.

A. Kevin O'Rear stated:

I also want to note that, if you choose to apply for readmission to Notre Dame Law School in the future, your application will be reviewed on the basis of all of the facts of which we are aware at the time. Readmission to the Law School is not guaranteed, although whether you have filed litigation against the University will not, in and of itself, prevent you from being admitted.

We are, however, required to review each applicant's character and fitness to be admitted to the bar. We have received many messages from you in the past few years that are disturbing and which raise serious questions about your ability to pass a character and fitness review. I flag this so that you may (1) guide your behavior going forward and (2) be aware that the Law School may decide in the future that, based upon your conduct, including disturbing notes to University faculty and officials since your withdrawal, you are not eligible for readmission.

B. I responded by stating, “Why is this even a material consideration for re-admissions? Relationships with law school professors is not a part of application process. You’re reprimanding me without trial by the Hoynes Code, which probably does not apply to the time I am not a law student. Further, it is retaliation for using my First Amendment rights.” And, “per the law, I do not foresee any legal questions raised to pass a character and fitness test. *See* I.C. 35-38-9-10(b)(4)-(6), (d) & (e). In fact, I feel discriminated by your answer on my character and fitness.” (*Italics in original*).

- LXXV. On May 21, 2020, in the Southern District Court for New York, I filed a motion to intervene in a pending case against T.H. (T.E.) Trump, in his personal capacity: *Doe et al. v. The Trump Corp. et al.*, No. 1:18-cv-09936-LGS (S.D.N.Y. May 26, 2020), Dkt. 272 (subject matter found but denied intervention), *appeal denied* No. 20-1706 (2d Cir. October 9, 2020) *cert. denied*, *Patel v. Trump Corp.*, No. 20-1513 (U.S. June 14, 2021), *reh’g denied* (U.S. Aug. 2, 2021).
- LXXVI. In July 2020, Policy Advisor Donald Trump Jr. posted an Instagram post [OMITTED], and I move out of my downtown Indianapolis apartment.
- LXXVII. For Spring 2021, I again re-applied for re-admissions. I was again denied re-admissions upon the recommendation of the University of Notre Dame University Counseling Center.
- LXXVIII. I contacted the Biden-Harris Transition Team to update them about my situation.
- LXXIX. On Inauguration Day 2021, T.H., T.H. (T.E.) Biden is sworn in as the President of the United States to become T.H., T.H. (T.E.), T.H. (T.E.) Biden, and, as a part of his inaugural address, T.H., T.H. (T.E.), T.H. (T.E.) Biden stated that the People of the United States are in an “un-civil war,” eluding to the general climate inside the United States borders. T.H., T.H. (T.E.), T.H. (T.E.) Biden mentioned a word

pattern from paragraph IX. I contacted the White House to inform them about the contract, mentioned in paragraphs VI, IX, XXXIII, XXVII and LVI, which I also assumed T.H., T.H. (T.E.), T.H. (T.E.) Biden already knew from his term in office as Vice President of the United States; I addressed T.H., T.H. (T.E.), T.H. (T.E.) Biden as President and Commander-in-Chief too, and I asked him for one more communication to ensure the contract, mentioned in paragraphs VI, IX, XXXIII, XXVII and LVI, for “\$750M to \$3.76B to be multiplied by three as treble monetary damages.”

- LXXX. President Biden copies body language and cough patterns during a press conference which I was led to watch.
- LXXXI. I applied to porn websites to be a model, and they told me to lose weight. I weighed 337lbs by this time.
- LXXXII. In July 2021, the loud car gave me my first asthma attack and caused my trachea to completely shut for a second. I woke up coughing. I developed bronchitis for about two months. I have been living at my family’s motel in Indianapolis since March 2021, as we are selling our Brownsburg, Indiana residence since my parents are building a bigger house in Greater Indianapolis. *See* paragraph LI.
- LXXXIII. On August 2, 2021, the Supreme Court of the United States gives a decision on my petition for re-hearing dated June 15, 2021. *Patel v. Trump Corp.*, No. 20-1513 (U.S. Jun. 14, 2021), *reh’g denied* (U.S. Aug. 2, 2021).
- LXXXIV. On August 14, 2021, at approximately 2:13PM EST, while looking at President Biden’s photo on my Instagram Feed, I heard, on the left side of my brain above my left ear, through the C.D.M.A. (Code Division Multiple Access)- or G.S.M. (Global System for Mobiles)- enabled, skull-built-in seamless psycho-bio-technology, “The deal is, if you can get us into court, you get the money.” The

Instagram was from Fox News's account. Yet, at other times, White House verified accounts are also used to play messages.

- LXXXV. For Fall 2021, I again re-applied for re-admissions. This time, I was permanently denied re-admissions upon recommendation by the University of Notre Dame University Counseling Center. Contrary to prior communications with Jake Baska and Dean Kevin O'Rear, who are both agents of the University of Notre Dame Law School, I was told that I may only apply for as a first-year student to the University of Notre Dame Law School, which would require me to re-take the Law School Admissions Test, and that re-admissions application would not be considered for Spring 2022.
- LXXXVI. Some of the accessories/stressors in this situation were not fluent in the English language but could repeat my verbatim word patterns. In fact, throughout parts of America, many areas I visited are not-English-speaking. Grievance 20, Decl. of Independence (1776) (not using the System of English Laws is a form of tyranny, i.e., not speaking the English Language) & U.S. const. art. VI, § 1.
- LXXXVII. In addition, two (2) people have asked me to represent them as legal counsel, and I have not been able to represent them because I have not completed law school, as a result of the psycho-bio-tech stress weapon.
- LXXXVIII. Most sadly, this has affected my Thinking and intellectual Freedoms; religiously speaking, my Hindu *rajyoga* and Indian-religion modern bodybuilding.
- LXXXIX. In 2020, I was prescribed, but not diagnosed with a disease because of the technology factor, with various medications to counter the stress weapon's effects.
- XC. On December 14, 2020, I took a lie detector test, to show that I am not making this up. *See* Exs. A-C.

- XCI. The stress weapon remains operating, and the situation with the repeating of word patterns is also on-going.
- XCII. On October 3, 2022, the Supreme Court denied certiorari. *TE TE Raj K. Patel v. United States*, No. 1:21-cv-02004-LAS (C.F.C. Nov. 5, 2021), Dkt. 10, *aff'd in part & rev'd in part*, No. 22-1131 (Fed. Cir. May 19, 2022), ECFs, 31, 40, 44, 46 & 48, *cert. denied*, No. 22-5280 (U.S. Oct. 3, 2022).
- XCIII. Currently, I am about 400 pounds, unforeseeable and unagreed upon weight gain and after breach of contract.
- XCIV. On June 27, 2021, I made a Religious Consciousness Complaint with the United States Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Civil Rights citing the happenings of religious violence, particularly of our Western and/or Indo-European type, in this complaint, which are also present in *Patel v. The Trump Corp.*, No. 20-1513 (U.S. June 14, 2021), *reh'r'g denied* (U.S. Aug. 2, 2021). Receipt Number: 24886023. *See Ex. D.*
- XCV. This complaint to this Court for Federal Claims follows. *See Ex. F.*

CLAIMS

All paragraphs from above are incorporated into this section. Each claim is independent, and CAUSATION can be attached to each claim. The United States must pay LIABILITY because it caused the harm. The dollar amounts are from the old complaint in No. 1:21-cv-2004-LAS (C.F.C. 2021), and they need to be adjusted for on-going hyperinflation. The \$3.76B is roughly equal to \$4.54M; *see infra* for details.

CAUSATION: The United States has accepted the harm that has been and will be caused by the Hindu Terrorist Witch Goddess and other agreed upon harm by contract;

therefore, consistent with precedents of this Court of Federal Claims, below, the United States is the cause, but for (or substantial factor) and proximate cause.

- a. *Compare TE TE Raj K. Patel v. United States*, No. 1:21-cv-02004-LAS (C.F.C. Nov. 5, 2021), Dkts 7 & 9 *with* here.
- b. Op. & Order, *Villars v. United States*, No. 2014-5124, 590 F. App'x 962 (Fed. Cir. Nov. 7, 2014), Doc. 10-2.
- c. Appellant's Informal Br., *Villars v. United States*, No. 2014-5124, 590 F. App'x 962 (Fed. Cir. Nov. 7, 2014), Doc. 4.
- d. *Vargas v. United States*, No. 1:12-cv-508-EDK, 114 Fed.Cl. 226 (C.F.C. Jan. 27, 2014).
- e. Op. & Order, *SGS-92-X003 v. United States*, 1:97-cv-579-MCW (C.F.C. Sept. 26, 2014), Doc. 243.
- f. *SGS-92-X003 v. United States*, 1: 97-cv-579-MCW, 74 Fed.Cl. 637 (C.F.C. Jan. 19, 2007), Doc. 122.
- g. *SGS-92-X003 v. United States*, 1:97-cv-579-MCW (C.F.C. Feb. 9, 2009), Doc. 161.
- h. *6601 Dorchester Investment Group, LLC v. United States*, No. 1:20-cv-1427-MHS, 154 Fed.Cl. 685 (C.F.C. July 27, 2021).
- i. Op. & Order, *Higbie v. United States*, No. 2014-5042, 778 F.3d 990 (Fed. Cir. 2015), Doc. 30-2.
- j. Op. & Order, *Refaei v. United States*, No. 2017-1399 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 23, 2018), Doc. 36-2.
- k. Op., *Janowsky v. United States*, 133 F.3d 888 (Fed. Cir. 1998).
- l. *Todd v. United States*, 386 F.3d 1091 (Fed. Cir. 2004).

- m. *Douglas P. Fleming, LLC v. Dep't of Veterans Affairs*, CBCA 3655, 3666 (Sept. 27, 2022).
 - n. *Schneider v. United States*, No. 1:21-cv-01876-MMS (C.F.C. Apr. 7, 2022).
 - o. *United States v. Navajo Nation*, 556 U.S. 287, 290 (U.S. 2009) accord *United States v. Mitchell* (“*Mitchell II*”), 463 U.S. 206 (U.S. 1983) (damages “naturally follows”) quoted in *Villars v. United States*, No. 2014-5124 * 7, 590 F. App'x 962 * 7 (Fed. Cir. Nov. 7, 2014) quoting *Holmes v. United States*, 657 F.3d 1303, 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2011)? ECF 31. Due Process Cl.-Prejudice, U.S. const. amend. v.
 - p. Prof. Larry A. DiMatteo, *The Norms of Contract: The Fairness Inquiry and the “Law of Satisfaction” — A Nonunified Theory*, 24 Hofstra L. Rev. 349 (1995), <http://scholarlycommons.law.hofstra.edu/hlr/vol24/iss2/8>.
 - q. Prof. Trevor J. Pemberton, D.Phil., Fang-Yuan Li Erin K. Hanson, Niyati U. Mehta, Sunju Choi, Jack Ballantyne, John W. Belmont, Prof. Noah A. Rosenberg, Ph.D., Chris Tyler-Smith, and Prof. Pragna I. Patel, Ph.D., *Impact of Restricted Marital Practices on Genetic Variation in an Endogamous Gujarati Group*, 149 Am. J. of Physical Anthropology 92, 92-103 (2012), www.doi:10.1002/ajpa.22101, (1-26) (contributing to Stanford University’s policy on appropriating and taking my genes); see Ex. E.
 - r. Presidential Records Act, 44 U.S.C. §§ 2201–2209, will have allow us to access the necessary records.
 - s. See Pet. for Writ of Cert., *Patel v. United States*, No. 22-5280 * 1-65 (U.S. Oct. 3, 2022).
- One. **Breach of Good Faith & Fair Dealing - The United States breached the covenant of good faith and fair dealing by not allowing ensure that nothing permanent**

can happened to me and expedite the recovery process when the situation entered a stalemate. Possibly the United States breached good faith and fair dealing by not giving good faith and fair dealing to the earlier judicial processes.

- a. *See* Procedural History and Related Cases.
- b. Presidential Records Act, 44 U.S.C. §§ 2201–2209, will have allow us to access the necessary records.

Two. **Breach of Contract – The United States breached the contract it and I entered into about living under the stress weapon so the United States – and I – can learn about this terrorism and its goals, with my damages to be paid to me. This breach of contract includes breach of good faith and fair dealing.**

- a. The contract was entered into under T.H., T.H., T.H. (T.E.) Bush’s presidency, as described in paragraphs VI and IX.
- b. Each President repeats my word patterns after making contact with them and asking them to communicate back.
- c. T.H., T.H., T.H. (T.E.) Obama verified the contract, while he was on the campaign trail, and throughout his terms as described in paragraphs XIV, XXVII(K), XXIX, and XXXI.
- d. T.H. (T.E.) Trump verifies the contract, as mentioned in paragraphs XL, LVI (especially sign language), LX, LXV, and LXXVIII. The contract is breached when I exceed the amount of weight when I would have excess skin from weight gain, as mentioned in paragraph LXXIV.
- e. T.H., T.H. (T.E.), T.H. (T.E.) Biden is sworn in and affirms the contract, after I contact him via www.whitehouse.gov, as mentioned in paragraphs LXXX, LXXXI, LXXXII, and LXXXVI.

f. See Claim 1.

g. Relief:

i. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2) – Damages are the amount of \$330M for violation of equal protection clause + \$187M weight gain + time for weight to loss + grades and scores deflation + loss of attending certain universities + loss of not becoming a lawyer + extra skin from weight loss (irreversible) + living under the stress + living with parents + defamation + having to take time off of law school and college + loss of gain = \$3.76B.

ii. Promissory Estoppel.

Three. ***Quantum Meruit* - There is unjust enrichment of the contractual/employment-type obligations we entered into.**

a. Relief:

i. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2) – Damages are the amount of \$330M for violation of equal protection clause + \$187M weight gain + time for weight to loss + grades and scores deflation + loss of attending certain universities + loss of not becoming a lawyer + extra skin from weight loss (irreversible) + living under the stress + living with parents + defamation + having to take time off of law school and college + loss of gain = \$3.76B.

Four. **Constructive Contract - This Court can construct a contract from the facts here, if it does not find that a contract has been well-pleaded.**

a. Relief:

i. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2) – Damages are the amount of \$330M for violation of equal protection clause + \$187M weight gain + time for

weight to loss + grades and scores deflation + loss of attending certain universities + loss of not becoming a lawyer + extra skin from weight loss (irreversible) + living under the stress + living with parents + defamation + having to take time off of law school and college + loss of gain = \$3.76B.

Five. **Quasi-Contract - There is a contract here and all recovery under contracts law should be allowed.**

a. Relief:

i. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2) – Damages are the amount of \$330M for violation of equal protection clause + \$187M weight gain + time for weight to loss + grades and scores deflation + loss of attending certain universities + loss of not becoming a lawyer + extra skin from weight loss (irreversible) + living under the stress + living with parents + defamation + having to take time off of law school and college + loss of gain = \$3.76B.

Six. **Establishment of Religion – The United States established religion when it omitted to protect me from the terrorist who was dressed as a Hindu god and made me live through tortious technology.**

a. *See generally* paragraphs, especially paragraphs LV(A), (B), & (F), and XCI, and note 4.

b. Monroe Doctrine (1823) as extended to Her Majesty's Commonwealth of Nations – Great Britain and India (constituted as the "Sovereign Socialist Secular Democratic Republic") and https://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/PV.8452; National Security Advisor John Bolton invoked the Monroe Doctrine in

describing the Trump administration's policy in the Americas, saying “In this administration, we're not afraid to use the word Monroe Doctrine...It's been the objective of American presidents going back to [President] Ronald Reagan to have a completely democratic hemisphere,” <https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/news/john-bolton-were-not-afraid-to-use-the-word-monroe-doctrine>.

- i. United Kingdom’s Religion: Long Live The Queen!
- ii. India’s Religion: Long Live Mother India!
- c. The United States Constitution is itself a contract, e.g. by the governed and the government. *See generally* U.S. const. art. VI, § 1 & amend. I and Decl. of Indep. (1776).
- d. 42 U.S.C. § 2000bb–3 (“This chapter applies to all Federal law, and the implementation of that law, whether statutory or otherwise, and whether adopted before or after November 16, 1993.”).
- e. Relief:
 - i. 5 U.S.C. §§ 702 & 706.
 - ii. 42 U.S.C. §§ 1981 & 1983.
 - iii. 42 U.S.C. § 2000bb-1(c).
 - iv. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2).

Seven. **42 U.S.C. § 2000bb-1 – The United States substantially burdened my right to be re-admitted to the University of Notre Dame Law School when it did not protect my right of Free Exercise of Religion and/or Expression by allowing agents of the United States or terrorists or other unconstitutional act to prevent me from exercising, attending school, and interfering with the religious-side of my physical brain by placing the stress weapon and stress noise there.**

- a. Paragraphs LXXXIII, LV(A), (B), & (F), and XCI and note 4.
- b. U.S. const. amend. I.
- c. Relief:
 - i. 42 U.S.C. § 2000bb-1(c), and
 - ii. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2) – Damages are the amount of \$330M for violation of equal protection clause + \$187M weight gain + time for weight to loss + grades and scores deflation + loss of attending certain universities + loss of not becoming a lawyer + extra skin from weight loss (irreversible) + living under the stress + living with parents + defamation + having to take time off of law school and college + loss of gain = \$3.76B.

Eight. **President's Vested Powers – In my personal capacity, each President violated his oath of office when he did not preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution and its amendments, in my situation of peril.**

- a. *See generally* paragraphs.
- b. Constitution itself is a contract with the American people.
- c. The President's vested executive powers allowed each President to enter into the contract of interest and his oath requires that he preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States, which includes its amendments, including Amendments I, IV, VIII, XIII, and XIV.
- d. The vested powers are conditional upon The Definitive Treaty of Paris (1783), the Congressional Proclamation Respecting the Treaty of Paris of 1783 (January 14, 1783), and U.S. const. art. VI, §1.
- e. *Arthrex, Inc.*, No. 19-1434 at p. 23, 594 U.S. ____ (2021) (the executive power is to remain accountable to the people).

f. Relief:

i. 5 U.S.C. §§ 702 & 706.

ii. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2).

Nine. **President's Vested Powers – In my official capacity (ies), each President violated his oath of office when he did not preserve, protect and defend the Constitution and its amendments, in my situation of peril, and thus did not faithfully execute the office of the United States Presidency.**

a. *See generally* paragraphs.

b. Constitution itself is a contract with the American people.

c. The President's vested executive powers allowed each President to enter into the contract of interest and his oath requires that he preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States, which includes its amendments.

d. The vested powers are conditional upon The Definitive Treaty of Paris (1783), the Congressional Proclamation Respecting the Treaty of Paris of 1783 (January 14, 1783), and U.S. const. art. VI, §1.

e. *Wood v. Moss*, No. 13-115, p. 5 & 16, 572 U.S. 744 (2014) orders that "substantive content" of the message, including political, is evaluated when there is a "security risk" of an elected or appointed official and that immunity applies for enforcement of limiting speech. *See also Rubin v. United States*, 525 U.S. 990, 990-991 (1998) (Breyer, J., dissenting from denial of certiorari) ("The physical security of [an honorable] has a special legal role to play in our constitutional system.").

f. *Arthrex, Inc.*, No. 19-1434 at p. 23, 594 U.S. ____ (2021) (the executive power is to remain accountable to the people).

- g. Full Faith and Credit Clause, which gives me constitutional right not to be battered or immunity, and Oath of President's Office requires that the vested powers be used in a certain way.
 - h. Absolute sovereign immunity is not applicable to T.H. President of the United States to T.E. Student Body President T.E. Student Body President Raj Patel, as T.E. is precedent.
 - i. Relief:
 - i. 5 U.S.C. §§ 702 & 706.
 - ii. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2).
- Ten. **Take Care Clause – I detrimentally relied on each President taking care that the laws be faithfully executed, if there is no contract, and that I would be free from the stress weapon.**
- a. *See generally* paragraphs.
 - b. Constitution is a social contract itself.
 - c. Constitution is a contract with each corporate office or body politic within the Lockean-Machiavelli set up.
 - d. U.S. const. amend. V-Due Process.
 - e. The Definitive Treaty of Paris (1783), the Congressional Proclamation Respecting the Treaty of Paris of 1783 (January 14, 1783), and U.S. const. art. VI, §1.
 - f. Relief:
 - i. 5 U.S.C. §§ 702 & 706.
 - ii. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2).
 - iii. Promissory Estoppel.

Eleven. **Preceding Clause – The United States violated Article VI, Section 1 of the United States Constitution when it did not protect me from the psycho-bio-tech stress-depression weapon and violated my inalienable right life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness and breached security of peace and harmony.**

- a. *See generally* paragraphs, especially paragraphs XXVII, XLVI, LVIII, & LXIV.
- b. Article VI, § 1 of the United States Constitution refers to the Declaration of Indep. (1776), the Treaty of Paris (1783), the Congressional Proclamation Respecting the Treaty of Paris of 1783 (January 14, 1783), and other Founding Documents.
- c. I detrimentally relied on the President of the United States, the Department of Justice, the Federal Bureau of Investigations, and other departments and bureaus to restore my constitutional guarantee and let me live my life.
- d. Relief:
 - i. 5 U.S.C. §§ 702 & 706.
 - ii. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2).

Twelve. **Privileges and/or Immunities Clause – The United States violated the privileges and immunities clause in the original constitution and the privileges and immunities clause in the 14th Amendment when it left me in peril or this situation after I attained my first student government presidency of the B.C.S.C. and thereafter as student government president of Emory University, Inc.**

- a. *See generally* paragraphs.
- b. As mentioned in Grievance 21, Decl. of Indep. (1776), the Treaty of Paris (1783), and U.S. const. art. VI, § 1, I have constitutional immunity as The Excellent and The Excellent from weapons of the United States. I also have the privilege of knowing what caused the peril.

- c. Grievance 21, Decl. of Indep. (1776) and U.S. const. art. VI, § 1 explain what the president's and executive's vested powers must be used for and what faithfully execute the office of the presidency means.
- d. *Slaughter-House Cases*, 83 U.S. (16 Wall.) 36, 71, and 77-78 (1873) ("the clause was interpreted to convey limited protection pertinent to a small minority of rights, such as the right to seek federal office"; privileges of other "butchers," applied as well to students, student government presidents, and incumbent and former elected and appointed officials) (but privileges for elected or appointed officials who are not citizens of a state or the United States would not have the privileges of that office, i.e. executive privilege not applicable) (natural-born would have the precedent over naturalized for the same office).
- e. The Supreme Court, in *Corfield v. Coryell*, 6 F. Cas. 546 (1823), also states that the Privileges and Immunities Clause, United States Constitution Article IV, Section 2, Clause 2 also includes the "Protection by the government; the enjoyment of life and liberty, *with the right to acquire and possess property of every kind*, and to pursue and obtain happiness and safety; subject nevertheless to such restraints as the government may justly prescribe for the general good of the whole." *Corfield v. Coryell*, 6 F. Cas. 546 (1823) (Washington, J.) (emphasis added) and U.S. const. art. IV, § 2, cl. 2 ("Privileges & Immunities Clause"); *see also* U.S. const. amend. XIV, § 1 ("Privileges or Immunities Clause") and 42 U.S.C. §§ 1981-1983.
- f. On July 12, 1816, Thomas Jefferson said to Samuel Kercheval, also known as H. Tompkinson, the following, which advocates for remedying the use of psychological weapons, such as the stress weapon:

- i. I am certainly not an advocate for frequent and untried changes in laws and constitutions. I think moderate imperfections had better be borne with; because, when once known, we accommodate ourselves to them, and find practical means of correcting their ill effects. But I know also, that laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths disclosed, and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also, and keep pace with the times. We might as well require a man to wear still the coat which fitted him when a boy, as civilized society to remain ever under the regimen of their barbarous ancestors. Thomas Jefferson to Samuel Kercheval. *The Thomas Jefferson Papers at the Library of Congress*, Series 1: General Correspondence 1651 to 1827, Retrieved from the Library of Congress, <https://www.loc.gov/item/mtjbib022494/>.

g. Relief:

- i. 5 U.S.C. §§ 702 & 706.
- ii. 18 U.S.C. § 242.
- iii. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2).
- iv. 42 U.S.C. §§ 1981-1983.

Thirteen. **Equal Protection Clause – The United States violated the Equal Protection Clause in the Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause to reinstate its protection over me.**

- a. *See generally* paragraphs.

- b. *Bolling*, 347 U.S. at 497 cited in *Windsor*, 570 U.S. at 804 (discussing equal protection under the Fifth Amendment).
- c. U.S. const. amend. V.
 - i. Equality – I was treated not fairly differently in Fair Play of Due Process of each material moment in the supply chain.
 - ii. Equity – I earned the protection of the United States after attaining two political offices.
- d. Relief:
 - i. 5 U.S.C. §§ 702 & 706.
 - ii. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2).
 - iii. 42 U.S.C. §§ 1981-1983.

Fourteen. **Right of Privacy – The United States violated my privacy when it searched and seized my word patterns and then disseminated those same word patterns.**

- a. *See generally* paragraphs.
- b. *Lange*, No. 20-18 at p 21, 594 U.S. at ____ (2021) (castle doctrine creates an impenetrable shield against others).
- c. Relief:
 - i. 5 U.S.C. §§ 702 & 706.
 - ii. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2).
 - iii. 42 U.S.C. §§ 1981-1983.

Fifteen. **Taking – The United States took my property when it took my verbatim word patterns and used it in the speeches of elected officials and news anchors.**

- a. *See generally* paragraphs, including, but not limited to, paragraph LXXV.
- b. Nonetheless, my verbatim word patterns were taken from me, but if they were taken for public use, including but not limited to disciplinary or

correctional efforts, I did not have “just compensation,” pursuant to the Fifth Amendment or the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution. U.S. const. amend. V & XIV. Theft or taking also necessitates a breach of the Fourth Amendment. U.S. const. amend. IV.

- c. *See also United States v. Lee*, 106 U.S. 196, 220 (1882) (Miller, J.).
- d. Immunity is not applicable to Takings and each President’s individual capacities.
- e. Relief:
 - i. U.S. const. amend. V. (“just compensation”).
 - ii. 5 U.S.C. §§ 702 & 706.
 - iii. 18 U.S.C. § 242.
 - iv. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2).
 - v. 42 U.S.C. §§ 1981-1983.

Sixteen. **Full Faith and Credit Clause – The United States violated the Full Faith and Credit Clause when it left me in peril or this situation after I attained my first student government presidency of the B.C.S.C. and thereafter as student government president of Emory University, Inc., therefore, disrespecting my “public Act[s],” which are magistrate positions and give me the style of “The Excellent.”**

- a. *See generally* paragraphs.
- b. This Clause gives me a constitutional right not to be battered or assaulted with taxpayer resources.
- c. I felt like that my rights as a co-leader from The Declaration of Indep. (U.S. 1776) (i.e. right to represent in a charter and freedom from interference in a charter) and my rights as a student from the Declaration of Indep. (1776)

(i.e. right to be represented in a charter) were violated, which are fundamentally essential for my “[S]afety and [H]appiness.” The Decl. of Indep. (U.S. 1776). U.S. const. art. VI, § 1.

d. The Congressional Proclamation Respecting the Treaty of Paris of 1783 (January 14, 1783) (full faith should be given). U.S. const. art. VI, § 1.

e. The President is contracted via the United States Constitution with each of these political positions to protect and defend. Hence, absolute sovereign immunity is not applicable to T.H. President of the United States to T.E. Student Body President T.E. Student Body President Raj Patel, as T.E. is precedent. Presidents of the United States Biden, Trump, Bush and Obama each waived immunity, just in case, applicable to happenings, through a detailed conversation with friend and then-to-be-Class President, and with communication through television with President Trump and President Biden. Contract Cl., U.S. const. Immunity is applicable in civil matters (acts but not inactions), not these criminal and civil-crime matters, and legislatively waived. *See also* 18 U.S.C. §§ 241-242 and 42 U.S.C. §§ 1981-1984 and 18 U.S.C. §§ 1346, 1951 & 1961. U.S. const. art. VI, § 1 and Grievance 21, Decl. of Indep. (1776). Counter weapons have also been unduly preempted. U.S. const. amend. II.

f. Relief:

- i. 5 U.S.C. §§ 702 & 706.
- ii. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2).
- iii. 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983.
- iv. 42 U.S.C. § 2000bb-1(c).

Seventeen. **Thirteenth Amendment – The United States allowed for slavery, despite me relying on the preexisting social contract, the United States Constitution, that the President or another officer of the United States would perform their constitutional contractual duty to free me from this on-going slavery.**

- a. *See generally* paragraphs, especially paragraph LVII.
- b. “Slavery” in Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary (1828) (“submission to a dominating influence”).
- c. *See also* 42 U.S.C. §§ 1981(a)-(c) (“Equal rights under the law”), 1982 (“Property rights of citizens”) & 1983 (“Civil action for deprivation of rights”).
- d. *See also* 18 U.S.C. § 242.
- e. Relief:
 - i. 5 U.S.C. §§ 702 & 706.
 - ii. 18 U.S.C. § 2383.
 - iii. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2).
 - iv. 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
 - v. 42 U.S.C. § 2000bb-1(c).

Eighteen. **Due Process – The United States let my Fair Play in Commerce be violated while I was a student at B.C.S.C., Emory University, and the University of Notre Dame Law School, while sitting for my various standardized and admissions tests, and while I was partaking in other things preparing for the workforce.**

- a. *See generally* paragraphs.
- b. U.S. const. amend. V. & art. I, § 8.
- c. 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000a(c) & 2000a-2.
- d. Relief:

- i. 5 U.S.C. §§ 702 & 706.
- ii. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2).
- iii. 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

Nineteen. **Treaty of Paris (1783) – The United States violated the Treaty of Paris by not protecting me with its conditionally transferred sovereignty to maintain peace and harmony in my environs.**

- a. *See generally* paragraphs.
- b. *See* U.S. const. art. VI, § 1.
- c. Relief:
 - i. 5 U.S.C. §§ 702 & 706.
 - ii. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2).
 - iii. 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

Twenty. **18 U.S.C. § 241 – The United States, its delegates, including teachers, faculty, and deans, and the Brownsburg Police Department conspired to “oppress” or “deprive” or “threaten” me of right of Free Exercise of Religion by causing unwanted changes in academic and physical and social performance.**

- a. *See generally* paragraphs.
- b. Conspiracy, overt act not required.
- c. Relief:
 - i. 18 U.S.C. § 242.
 - ii. 42 U.S.C. § 2000bb-1(c), and
 - iii. 28 U.S.C. § 1491(a)(1)-(2).

Twenty-one. **18 U.S.C. § 242 – The United States deprived me of my right of religious free exercise because of my pornography videos I made, which countered the stress weapon, taking support away from “boots on the ground.”**

- a. *See generally* paragraphs.
- b. Relief:
 - i. 18 U.S.C. § 242.
 - ii. 42 U.S.C. § 2000bb-1(c), and
 - iii. 28 U.S.C. § 1491(a)(1)-(2).

Twenty-two. **18 U.S.C. § 247(a)(2) – The United States deprived me of my right of religious free exercise because of my pornography videos I made, which countered the stress weapon, taking support away from “boots on the ground.”**

- a. *See generally* paragraphs.
- b. Relief:
 - i. 18 U.S.C. § 242.
 - ii. 42 U.S.C. § 2000bb-1(c), and
 - iii. 28 U.S.C. § 1491(a)(1)-(2).

Twenty-three. **18 U.S.C. § 241 – The United States, its delegates, including teachers, faculty, and deans, and the Brownsburg Police Department conspired to “oppress” or “deprive” me of my privileges and immunities secured to me by the United States Constitution after attaining each of my political offices as student government president of the B.C.S.C. and Emory University, Inc.**

- a. *See generally* paragraphs.
- b. Conspiracy, overt act not required.
- c. Relief:
 - i. 18 U.S.C. § 241.
 - ii. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2).

Twenty-four. **18 U.S.C. § 247(a)(2) – The United States and The University of Notre Dame intentionally obstructed, by force, Plaintiff in the enjoyment of his free exercise**

of religious beliefs, or attempted to do so, by using the psycho-bio-tech weapon with white rings/disks which caused a significant change in physical exercising and dieting and professional commitment.

- a. *See generally* paragraphs, especially paragraph I, XXII, LV, XXVII(A)-(C), XCI, and XCII.
- b. *See supra*, note 4.
- c. Relief:
 - i. 18 U.S.C. § 247(d).
 - ii. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2).

Twenty-five. **18 U.S.C. § 1951 – The United States obstructed, delayed, or affected commerce by changing my commercial output by robbing or extorting me of my personal property right to attend specific colleges and law schools and committed physical violence towards me.**

- a. *See generally* paragraphs.
- b. Conspiracy, overt act not required.
- c. Relief:
 - i. 18 U.S.C. § 1951(a).
 - ii. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2).

Twenty-six. **18 U.S.C. § 1951 – The United States obstructed, delayed, or affected commerce by changing my transcript, an article or commodity of commerce, by robbing or extorting or conspiring to rob or extort me of my personal property right to attend specific colleges and law schools and committed physical violence towards me.**

- a. *See generally* paragraphs.
- b. Relief:

- i. 18 U.S.C. § 1951(a).
- ii. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2).

Twenty-seven. **18 U.S.C. § 1951 – The United States obstructed, delayed, or affected commerce by robbing or extorting or conspiring to rob or extort me of my verbatim word patterns and inserting them into news anchors, movies, and soap operas.**

- a. *See generally* paragraphs.
- b. Relief:
 - i. 18 U.S.C. § 1951(a).
 - ii. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2).

Twenty-eight. **18 U.S.C. § 1951 – The United States obstructed, delayed, or affected commerce by robbing or extorting or conspiring to rob or extort me of my verbatim word patterns related to COVID-19 asymptomatic patients while at the Trump International Hotel.**

- a. *See generally* paragraphs.
- b. Relief:
 - i. 18 U.S.C. § 1951(a).
 - ii. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2).

Twenty-nine. **18 U.S.C. § 1341-51 – The United States devised or intended to devise a scheme or artifice to defraud me of its protection by using signs, signals, pictures, and sound on internet wire and on cable television.**

- a. *See generally* paragraphs.
- b. Produced arbitrary undergraduate and law school admissions results because of this stress-weapon that is controlled by the United States intervened and lowered the merit on the application.

- c. The transfer of word / data can be happening through, including but limited to, beaming (e.g., satellite, radio, soundwaves, etc.) or wire (e.g. internet, telecommunications, etc.).
- d. No intention of freeing me of the terrorism.
- e. Relief:
 - i. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2).
 - ii. 18 U.S.C. §§ 1341 & 1343.

Thirty. **Tortious interference with business transaction – The United States interfered with my contract with the University of Notre Dame and Emory University when it allowed for a stress weapon to be repeatedly and continuously be used on me.**

- a. *See generally* paragraphs.
- b. Relief: 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2).

Thirty-one. **42 U.S.C. § 9501(2)(A) – The United States recklessly violated the Mental Health Bill of Rights when it did not make sure that the State of Indiana was using the least restrictive means when putting individuals on emergency detention.**

- a. *See generally* paragraphs.
- b. Relief:
 - i. 18 U.S.C. § 242.
 - ii. 42 U.S.C. § 2000bb-1(c), and
 - iii. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2).

Thirty-two. **42 U.S.C. § 1981 – In my personal capacity, the United States did not give me full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of persons and property as is enjoyed by white citizens, and subject me to like punishment, pains, penalties, taxes, licenses, and exactions of every kind.**

- a. *See generally* paragraphs.
- b. Relief:
 - i. 18 U.S.C. § 242.
 - ii. 18 U.S.C. § 2383.
 - iii. 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
 - iv. 42 U.S.C. § 2000bb-1(c), and
 - v. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2).

Thirty-three. **42 U.S.C. § 1981 – In my official capacity(ies), the United States did not give me full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of persons and property as is enjoyed by white citizens, and subject me to like punishment, pains, penalties, taxes, licenses, and exactions of every kind.**

- a. *See generally* paragraphs.
- b. Relief:
 - i. 18 U.S.C. § 241.
 - ii. 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
 - iii. 42 U.S.C. § 2000bb-1(c), and
 - iv. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2).

Thirty-four. **18 U.S.C. § 2441(d)(1) – The United States and the entity using the psycho-bio-tech stress weapon committed a war crime of torture by inducing mental pains, cruel or inhuman treatment, performing biological experiments, or intentionally causing serious bodily injury.**

- a. *See generally* paragraphs.
- b. Relief:
 - i. 18 U.S.C. § 2441(a).
 - ii. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2).

iii. 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

Thirty-five. **18 U.S.C. § 175 – The United States unlawfully retains a biological weapon (i.e. the psycho-bio-tech stress weapon) or conspired with another organization to same.**

a. *See generally* paragraphs, especially paragraphs, I, XXII, LV, XXVII(A)-(C), and XCII.

b. Relief:

i. 18 U.S.C. § 175(a).

ii. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2).

Thirty-six. **18 U.S.C. § 229 – The United States used a chemical weapon to the extent not permissible by law against me.**

a. *See generally* paragraphs, especially paragraph I, XXII, LV, XXVII(A)-(C), and XCII.

b. Relief:

i. 18 U.S.C. § 229A(a)-(b).

ii. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2).

Thirty-seven. **18 U.S.C. § 1832 – The United States took and distributed my trade secrets, my word patterns, for political service intended in interstate commerce, including for my service as each student government president in B.C.S.C. and Emory University, Inc.**

a. *See generally* paragraphs.

b. Relief:

i. 18 U.S.C. § 1832(b).

ii. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2).

Thirty-eight. **18 U.S.C. § 1961 – The United States is an aider and abettor in a R.I.C.O. conspiracy through extortion, honest services fraud, biological weapons, and chemical weapons.**

- a. *See generally* paragraphs.
 - i. Extortion – 18 U.S.C. § 1961.
 - ii. Honest services fraud – 18 U.S.C. § 1343.
 - iii. Biological weapon – 18 U.S.C. § 175.
 - iv. Chemical weapon – 18 U.S.C. § 229.
- b. *Asahi*, 480 U.S. at 102 (supply-chain terrorism and stream of commerce terrorism; transcripts; (fair) playing in Commerce). RICO takes form of extortion (i.e. threats with the use of biological weapon to quite school and/or political and/or law), wire fraud (beaming of communications and soundwaves) (18 U.S.C. § 1343), intimidating someone in Commerce (schools/transcripts) (18 U.S.C. § 1951), use of biological weapon (stress weapon/bio-tech brain wiring) (18 U.S.C. § 175), use of chemical weapon (18 U.S.C. § 229), and racketeering (18 U.S.C. § 1952).
- c. RICO is evaluated under a distinct precedent, *H.J. Inc.*, 492 U.S. at 248-250 (citations omitted).
- d. Relief:
 - i. 18 U.S.C. §§ 1963-64.
 - ii. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2).

Thirty-nine. **18 U.S.C. §§ 1091(a)(3)-(5) – The United States conducted genocide against a substantial part, i.e. one elected official is a substantial part, of my respective national, ethnic, racial, or religious group.**

- a. *See generally* paragraphs.

b. Relief:

i. 18 U.S.C. § 1091(b)(2).

ii. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2).

Forty. **Extreme Emotional Distress – The United States caused extreme emotional distress by leaving me unattended of its constitutional protection.**

a. Overall, since November 2017, I have taken unplanned and unwanted time off of law school which unduly and unwantedly effects my career timeline and unjustly limits my career choices, which all also causes me extreme emotional distress

b. *See generally* paragraphs.

c. Relief: 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2) - \$3.76B.

Forty-one. **Promissory Estoppel – I detrimentally relied on the United States in upholding its contract with me when I used the method in approaching this situation.**

a. *See generally* paragraphs.

b. Relief: 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2) - \$3.76B.

DEMAND FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, The Excellent, The Excellent Raj K. Patel, with the interest of upholding the contract with the United States and the Constitution, asks this Court of Federal Claims to enter judgement in his favor and grant either all or some of the following relief¹⁷:

1. Relief described in the claims section above.

17. *Loveladies Harbor, Inc. v. United States*, 27 F.3d 1545, 1554 (Fed. Cir. 1994) (*en banc*) (To recover against the government, a plaintiff must identify a “substantive right created by some money-mandating constitutional provision, statute or regulation that has been violated, or an express or implied contract with the United States.”).

2. Give respective orders to fulfill the statutory and constitutional obligations required to me, including but not limited to *writ of mandamus* and a *writ quo warranto*. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2). 28 U.S.C. §§ 1651. 18 U.S.C. §§ 1964-1968.
3. Enforcement and application of the privileges and immunities clauses and Full Faith and Credit Clauses. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2). 18 U.S.C. §§ 241 *et seq.* See generally *Arthrex, Inc.*, 594 U.S. ____ (2021).
4. Rectify academic information. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2). 18 U.S.C. §§ 1967.
5. Order Plaintiff into the law school of his choice, along with the order to require the law school to graduate Plaintiff with their J.D. degree. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2). See general reconstruction powers. *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka II*, 349 U.S. 294 (1955) (courts may enforce school enrollment “with all deliberate speed.”).
6. Award earned damages totaling multibillions – **after taxes \$4,544,703,655.35** [\$3.76B¹⁸ (Nov. 2021 numbers, plus adjusted for inflation and interest and elonged lost time of enjoyment)] – solely based on the horizontal trickle effect, including stream of Commerce; steps of organized playing in Commerce, per the contract. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2). Due Process. Commerce Clauses. 18 U.S.C. §§ 1964-1968. U.S. const. amend. V.
7. General order to seize all unlawful force over me. 28 U.S.C. § 1491(a)(1)-(2). 28 U.S.C. §§ 1651.
8. Order Plaintiff back into the Notre Dame Law School to complete course of study for his J.D. candidacy, within the minimum time required, 1.2667 semesters. 28

18. The settlement agreed with the Presidents of the United States is over \$330M for the battery with the bio-tech stress weapon, plus \$1M per pound gained (187lbs gained from 150lbs, 337) which is \$187M + time to lose weight + \$1B for lose in career + \$1B for college and law school application discrimination and unduly lowering the merit + reputational damages, including, but not limited to, my legitimacy + other consequential damages. **\$4,544,703,655.35 after taxes.**

U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2) and *Brown II*, 349 U.S. at 294 (courts may enforce school enrollment “with all deliberate speed.”). *See also* 28 U.S.C. § 1631.

9. Briefing on the bio-tech weapon, including effects and risks on regressive human evolution of Plaintiff and Plaintiff’s descendent, as all adversity impacts human evolution, and medicine/ weaponry for forward-evolution. The antidote would be top-top secret or under lesser security clearances. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2). Due Process.
10. Award value of contracted money. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2).
11. Re-distribution of advance weaponry to me, for Safety and Happiness, constitutionally. U.S. const. art. IV, §§ 1 & 2, cl. 1 & art. III, § 1.
12. Alternatively, construe this complaint as a motion for judicial review, and see if the \$40M witness pay is due for adjustment for hyperinflation per good faith and fair dealing.
13. Other remedies which the court might deem fit, including because of the attack on my celebrity. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491(a)(1)-(2). 5 U.S.C. §§ 702 & 706. 18 U.S.C. §§ 1964-1968.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Raj K. Patel
T.E., T.E. Raj K. Patel (*pro se*)
1239 Spring Lake Drive
Brownsburg, IN 46112
Hendricks County
317-450-6651 (cell)
rajp2010@gmail.com
www.rajpatel.live

J.D. Candidate, Notre Dame L. Sch.
President/Student Body President, Student Gov't Ass'n of
Emory U., Inc. 2013-2014 (corporate sovereign 2013-
present)
Student Body President, Brownsburg Cmty. Sch.
Corp./President, Brownsburg High Sch. Student Gov't
2009-2010 (corporate sovereign 2009-present)
Rep. from the Notre Dame L. Sch. Student B. Ass'n to the Ind.
St. B. Ass'n 2017
Deputy Regional Director, Young Democrats of Am.-High
Sch. Caucus 2008-2009
Co-Founder & Vice Chair, Ind. High Sch. Democrats 2009-
2010
Vice President of Fin. (Indep.), Oxford C. Republicans of
Emory U., Inc. 2011-2012

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

In addition to service to the United States by the Clerk of the Court of Federal Claims, I served the following individual via e-mail on October 3, 2022:

President Joe Biden

c/o Marina M. Kozmycz, Associate Gen. Counsel

The E.O.P. at the White House

1600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW

Washington, D.C. 20500

Phone: 202-457-1414

Marina.M.Kozmycz@oa.eop.gov

Vargas v. United States, 114 Fed.Cl. 226, 236 (C.F.C. 2014) (“The government’s reliance on 28 U.S.C. § 516 is misplaced.”).

Dated: October 3, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Raj K. Patel
T.E., T.E. Raj K. Patel (*pro se*)
1239 Spring Lake Drive
Brownsburg, IN 46112
Hendricks County
317-450-6651 (cell)
raj2010@gmail.com
www.rajpatel.live